Journal of Health Reports and Technology
Volume 9 · Issue 2 · e136287

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effect of the Extended Parallel Process Model on Self-efficacy of Type 2 Diabetic Patients

Ashkan Morovati, Sanaz Rustaee, Somaye Moayedi, Aminreza Askarpour Kabir, Mehran Shahraki, Ermia Maghsoodloo, Mahsa Mehdizadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
12 Mar 2023	8 Apr 2023	8 Apr 2023	10.5812/jhrt-136287

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** Hamid Hojjati, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

3 comments · 17 Mar 2023 – 4 Apr 2023

Hamid Hojjati Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Mar 2023

The doi of the references should be written
It would have been better for the p-value to be given to three decimal places
It would have been better if more references from 2022 had been used

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 4 Apr 2023

Dear author,
The submitted manuscript (ID: 136287) describes [The effect of Extended Parallel Process Model on self-efficacy of type 2 diabetic patients]. This manuscript is original and well-designed. Also, gives valuable information and supported by data adequately. In addition to the comments of the reviewers, pay attention to the following comments related to the associate editor.

• There are many grammar errors in this manuscript. I would also recommend that the authors pay particular attention to improving the grammar in their manuscript by cooperated with native English language professional. Check your whole manuscript for any typo and for English expression, in order to prevent this kind of mistakes.

• Consider the word count limitations: 250-350 words. In addition, write a structured abstract including:
o Background
o Objectives
o Methods
o Results
o Conclusions

• The logic of the current introduction should be revised, and I suggest organizing the Introduction section as following order: importance and meanings, previous studies (literature review), the gaps of previous studies, and objectives of this study.

• It is necessary that the two sections "conclusions" and "limitations of the study" are presented as subtitles "5.1" and "5.2", respectively.

• At least 80% of references must have DOI. Accordingly, use valid references to replace current references.References that have identification codes for "DOI", "PubMed" and "PubMed Central" should be included at the end of each reference.

• At least 80% of references must have DOI. Accordingly, use valid references to replace current references.References that have identification codes for "DOI", "PubMed" and "PubMed Central" should be included at the end of each reference.

• The subtitles of manuscript should be numbered.
• In the Manuscript text, reference numbers should be placed in parentheses ( ).

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 4 Apr 2023

Dear corresponding author
We are pleased to send you the review comments, included at the bottom of this letter. Please consider these suggestions. We look forward to receiving your revision and your point-by-point response to these comments. When you revise your manuscript please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using bold or colored text. All authors must check and approve of the revision before you submit it.

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 editors (s)

Journal of Health Reports and Technology

We are very grateful to you and the reviewers for their appropriate and constructive suggestions and proposed corrections to improve the manuscript (Ref: 136287): Evaluation of the frequency of academic failure and its influencing factors in medical students of a military training center. We revised the manuscript following their advice. Here below is the one-by-one response to the reviewer's comments. It should be noted that all changes were highlighted by yellow color in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1's Comments:

1- The DOI of the references should be written.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised. DOI or URL references were written.

2- It is better to express the P-value to three decimal places.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised. More recent references were used.

3- It would have been better if the references of 2022 were used more
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised

Reviewer 2's Comments:

4- Is this research being Experimental study? OR semi-experimental?
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

5- In the "Methods" section of the abstract, change the abbreviation "EEPM" to "EPPM".
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

6- In the keywords section, "Developed Parallel Process Model" should be changed to "Extended Parallel Process Model".
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

7- In the background section, "(9 and 10)" should be changed to "(9, 10)". In addition, "(7, 15 and 16)" should be changed to "(7, 15, 16)".
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

Associate Editor's Comments:

8- *There are many grammar errors in this manuscript. I would also recommend that the authors pay particular attention to improving the grammar in their manuscript by cooperated with native English language professional. Check your whole manuscript for any typo and for English expression, in order to prevent this kind of mistakes.*

Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

9- *Consider the word count limitations: 250-350 words. In addition, write a structured abstract including:*
o Background
o Objectives
o Methods
o Results
o Conclusions
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

10- *The logic of the current introduction should be revised, and I suggest organizing the Introduction section as following order: importance and meanings, previous studies (literature review), the gaps of previous studies, and objectives of this study.*
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

11- It is necessary that the two sections "conclusions" and "limitations of the study" are presented as subtitles "5.1" and "5.2", respectively.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

12- At least 80% of references must have DOI. Accordingly, use valid references to replace current references.References that have identification codes for "DOI", "PubMed" and "PubMed Central" should be included at the end of each reference.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

13- At least 80% of references must have DOI. Accordingly, use valid references to replace current references.References that have identification codes for "DOI", "PubMed" and "PubMed Central" should be included at the end of each reference.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

14- The subtitles of manuscript should be numbered.
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

15- In the Manuscript text, reference numbers should be placed in parentheses ().
Thanks for the reviewer; it was revised.

Kind regards

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 8 Apr 2023 – 8 Apr 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 8 Apr 2023

The revised manuscript (ID: 136287) is sufficiently improved. The authors have adequately addressed the reviewer's issues and provided satisfactory answers to all points. Therefore, the revised manuscript can be considered for publication in the "Journal of Health Reports and Technology".

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 8 Apr 2023

We are pleased to accept your manuscript (ID: 136287) in its current form which will now be forwarded to the publisher for copy editing and typesetting.