Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 10 · Issue 2 · e116250

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Geographical Distribution of Insomniac Patients in Western Iran

Shoeib Rahimi, Mohammad Rezaei, parasto setareh, Habibolah Khazaie, Hiwa Mohammadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 May 2021	11 Sep 2021	2 Oct 2021	10.5812/jcrps.116250

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

2 comments · 8 Sep 2021 – 8 Sep 2021

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 8 Sep 2021

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 8 Sep 2021

Minor Revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor

Thank you very much for your consideration.
We revised the manuscript based on the reviewer's comments. We also highlighted the corrections by red fonts and also answers to all comments below.

Minor Comment
The different parts of the study should be reviewed again in terms of the way they are written (write scientific English).
All parts were revised in terms of language.

Abstract
Background
The authors have not clearly specified the knowledge gap and the aim. It is better that this part be corrected.
The aim of the study and the knowledge gap are given in the main introduction and were also added to this part of the abstract.

Introduction
Second line, first reference: this reference should be removed.
The reference was removed.

Method:

In part of the study methods, the GIS software should be introduced, including which version was used.
The software version was mentioned along with its reference.

Procedures:

Fourth paragraph
How was the criterion of the distance of patients' homes from crowded areas calculated? For example, if a person is 10 kilometers away from a highway, which of these two groups would they be placed in? Did the authors of the study consider a threshold for these two groups
(noisy and quiet)?
In fact, the noisy group consisted only of homes on the edge of highways, the airport, intersections and main streets. This meant homes that were located directly on the immediate edge of these places. Explanations were added to the text.

Statistical analysis:

The significance level of the study should be stated.
A significance level of 0.05 was added to the text.
Ethics Code:

Did the authors of the study obtain informed consent from the participants before conducting the study? This should be mentioned in this paragraph.
Consent was obtained and added to the text.

Results

Demographic findings

First paragraph, third line: must definitely be reviewed again in terms of writing.

The sentence in question was rewritten.

GIS findings
Given that this study was conducted in Kermanshah province, the authors of this study had access only to the data of patients of this city.
Was this image taken from another source? Cite its source. If this map was drawn based on the data of this study, given that there are only 12 samples from other provinces in this study, a geographical distribution for the whole of Iran cannot be drawn with such limited data; therefore, it is better that this map be removed from the study.
The map in question is the result of the data of the present study and the output of the GIS software analysis, and in a way confirms the Referral status of the Kermanshah sleep center. Our aim with this map was not to examine the geographical distribution of all patients in Iran; only patients referred to Kermanshah were considered. However, these data in a way point out the importance of establishing similar centers in other regions of the country; therefore, the authors of the article request that this map not be removed from the article.

Discussion
First paragraph: it is better that the main findings of the research be stated in the first sentence of the discussion, and that the answer to the research question presented at the end of the introduction be given. Added.

First paragraph, second to third line: this sentence is not appropriate for the discussion. Removed.

First paragraph, line 9: this sentence is appropriate for the introduction of the article. Therefore, it is better that it be removed from the discussion. Removed.

Second paragraph, lines 9 to 15: the results of this study should also be used in this part.

Based on the results obtained from the study, this part can be discussed. These few sentences were in fact written to justify the study findings (no difference in sleep characteristics between the group living in a quiet environment and the group living in a noisy environment).

Last paragraph: this part is the limitations of the study, so it is better that it be placed in that section. Moved to the limitations section.

Conclusion

Overall, it is better that this part be rewritten, with precise attention to the items that should be addressed in the Conclusion. The Conclusion should be presented about the results of the study. Corrected.

Third to sixth line: this sentence is in fact a kind of suggestion for the future, so it is better that it be placed in the discussion. Corrected.

Sixth line to the end of the conclusion: this part is appropriate for the discussion. Corrected.

Limitation
More limitations can be considered for this study; for example, due to the small sample size, some of the results may not have become significant; for this reason, the small sample size can be considered a limitation. The small sample size was added as a limitation.

.

PEER REVIEW FORM

Manuscript ID:
116250
Date: 2021-07-27

Total Score: (min: 0, max: 20) : 14

Proper Article TITLE? Yes

Does the title reflect the content appropriately? Yes

Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE? NO

Importance and originality or the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?) Yes

Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations? Yes

Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these? Yes

Is there structured ABSTRACT? Yes
How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)? Yes
Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?) No
Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH (HYPERLINK "http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html" http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)? No

Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes
Does INTRODUCTION include: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims"? Yes

Clearly describe selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)? yes
Study Design Described Sufficiently? Yes
Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes
Subjects Representative of Target Population? Yes
Provided sample size calculation or justification? N/A
Control Subjects Appropriate N/A
Power of study declared? NO
Reported actual P values for primary analyses? NO
Blinding of Investigators (if possible)? N/A
Blinding of subjects (if possible)? N/A
Identify the methods, apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)? NO
Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

NO
Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known? NO
Describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations? N/A
Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration? N/A
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? NO
Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes
Identified all statistical methods unambiguously? Yes
Explain Ethical Considerations? NO

Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS? Yes
RESULTS recorded appropriately? Yes
Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES? Yes
Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes
Repeat the data in the tables and Text? Yes
Emphasize or summarize only important observations? Yes
Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail? No
Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support? No
Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries? N/A
Duplicate data in graphs and tables? NO
Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”? NO

Relevance of the DISCUSSION section? NO
CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated? No
What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results? N/A
Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS? Yes
Are the conclusions supported by the discussion? Yes

Appropriateness of the REFERENCES? Yes
Proper Writing of the REFERENCES? Yes
References for the last 5 years? NO
Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)? N/A
Indicate references in parentheses? Yes

Proper Style for Medical Writing? NO
Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used? Yes
Proper English Grammar and Writing? No
Which sections are too long? Conclusion is too long.
Which sections are too short? none

Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood? None
Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:
What additional information would you need to reproduce this study?
Your Final Conclusion is: Approve, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Decline

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 2 Oct 2021 – 2 Oct 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 2 Oct 2021

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 2 Oct 2021

Accept