OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.91837
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(1); e91837

Peer Review Report for "Association of Metabolic Syndrome and Its Components with Survival of Older Adults"

Author(s): Ali Bijani, Seyed Reza Hosseini, Reza Ghadimi, Simin Mouodi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 13 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Jan 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
- In the ct, the Background is not adopt with the title and objective of the article.
- Date of study should be mentioned in the abstract.
- Reason for 2-tailed significance should be explained
- Discussion is poor
- Strengths and limitations of this study are not well considered.
- There is a difference between the mean age of males and females that could influence the results. This point must be addressed in the study
- The sampling errors needs to be well adressed
- There is a bi

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Aug 2019

Dear AE,

This is a prospective study, so the authors should omit words like “impact” and apply better words in all of the manuscript and title.
Abstract, Results:
- The mean age of participants, the frequency of both genders, and the frequency of MetS according to four criteria should be mentioned.
Introduction:
- Why did this study conduct on older adults?
Methods:
- How the participants were selected? The flowchart of participants should be mentioned.
For the definition of metabolic syndrome, it is better to show it in a table.
Results:
- The mean±SD of MetS components should be described in Table 1.
- Table 2: what is the analysis?
- What were the mean years of follow up? And how many participants did loss to follow up?
- The discussion needs to be rewritten based on your finding and their controversies or consistency.
- Also the limitation and strengths of the study should be mentioned.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
So sorry for the delay.
I think before making any decision, the authors should make the corrections according to the respected reviewers' comments.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Answer to dear reviewers´ comments

Dear Dr. Prof. Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili

Editor-in-Chief | International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism

Hello!

Thanks for your comments about our manuscript entitled "The impact of metabolic syndrome and its components on survival of older adults" with Manuscript ID: 91837.

The comments of dear reviewers have been considered in the revised manuscript.

The answers are summarized in the table below. Revised points have been highlighted in yellow.

Dear reviewers´ comments	The answers
In the ct the Background is not adopt with the title and objective of the article.	The first sentence has been changed.
Date of study should be mentioned in the abstract.	Date of study has been included in the abstract.
Reason for 2-tailed significance should be explained.	It has been explained in Methods.
Discussion is poor.	Discussion has been changed.
Strengths and limitations of this study are not well considered.	Limitation and strengths of study has been improved.
There is a difference between the mean age of males and females that could influence the results. This point must be addressed in the study.	Thanks. This point has been added to discussion.
The sampling errors need to be well addressed.	Since the details about AHAP study have been described in previous published manuscript (1.Hosseini SR, Cumming RG, Kheirkhah F, Nooreddini H, Baiani M, Mikaniki E, et al. Cohort profile: the Amirkola Health and Ageing Project (AHAP). International journal of epidemiology. 2014; 43(5): 1393-400. 2.Bijani A, Ghadimi R, Mikaniki E, Kheirkhah F, Mozaffarpur SA, Motallebnejad M, Esmaili H, Majidi F, Cumming RG, Hosseini SR. Cohort Profile Update: The

	Amirkola Health and Ageing Project (AHAP). Caspian J Intern Med. 2017; 8(3): 205-12) we did not repeat them in this article; however, with respect to dear reviewer´s comment, methods for participants recruitment has been summarized in the revised article.
This is a prospective study, so the authors should omit words like "impact" and apply better words in all of the manuscript and title.	Respectfully, all of the "impact" words have been replaced by "effect"; in title and different sections of the manuscript.
Abstract, Results: **The mean age of participants, the frequency of both genders, and the frequency of MetS according to four criteria should be mentioned.**	The mean age of participants, the frequency of both genders, and the frequency of MetS according to four criteria have been mentioned in abstract.
Introduction **Why did this study conduct on older adults?**	Thanks, it has been mentioned in the last paragraph of Introduction. Furthermore, we aimed to assess the mortality and this event is more prevalent in older adults.
Methods: **How the participants were selected? The flowchart of participants should be mentioned.**	It has been mentioned in Methods; furthermore, the flowchart of participants has been attached.
Four definition of metabolic syndrome, it is better to show it in a table.	Thanks. It has been provided in Methods.
Results **The mean±SD of MetS components should be described in Table 1.**	They have been provided in Results.
Table 2: what is the analysis?	Thanks. This table has been improved in revised article.
What were the mean years of follow up? And how many participants did loss to follow up?	All of the participants were followed for five years to determine their survival or mortality status. None of them were lost to follow-up. It has been mentioned in Results.
The discussion needs to be rewritten based on your finding and their controversies or consistency.	Discussion has been changed.

Also the limitation and strengths of study should be mentioned.	Limitation and strengths of study has been improved.

With Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Arash Ghanbarian: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 11 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
As we mentioned before, it is better to substitute the words "effect or impact" with the word "association" in the manuscript.
It seems that is an "association" study.
Thanks.

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision (1)** 13 Jan 2020

Dear Authors,
You replied to the reviewers' comments carefully; however, the "effect" which was substituted for the "impact" was not a proper word. The study design is observational, so it is better to apply the "association" or the "relationship".
Please resubmit the revision within the next 72 hours.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Answer to dear reviewers´ comments

Dear Dr. Prof. Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili

Editor-in-Chief | International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism

Hello!

Thanks for your comments about our manuscript entitled "The impact of metabolic syndrome and its components on survival of older adults" with Manuscript ID: 91837.

The comment of dear reviewer to change the word "effect" with "association or relationship" has been considered in the revised manuscript.

All of revised words have been highlighted in yellow.

With Best Regards

Simin Mouodi, MD, MPH, PhD (Corresponding Author)

Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Health Research Institute, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (2) 14 Jan 2020

Dear Authors,

The revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.

Thanks.