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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.100241
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(3); e100241

Peer Review Report for "Audit of the Nursing Care Standards Before Coronary Angiography in Patients Visiting Angiography"

Author(s): Mohsen Mosaei, Ali Hassanpour Dehkordi, Fatemeh Driees, Shahriyar Salehitali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 Jan 2020
Revised Date:	6 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	6 Apr 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)

16 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Don't need to write "employment" on the title
Abstract :
- Correct the ritual. Correct spelling
- Finding will write clarity. Identify which one is poor or .....
- The results should be consistent with the findings. You mentioned in the findings that the majority were moderate and you wrote very poorly in the results.
- The results should be consistent with the findings. You mentioned in the findings that the majority were moderate and you wrote very poorly in the results.
- The importance of this study is in the findings of the audit. The researcher has been very demographic, but the results of the audit have not been determined due to the variety of care before angiography. Which nurse care is less or equal to standard care?
- In the discussion section, most of the citations are not related to the findings. Instead of miscellaneous studies, invoke audit studies in this field.
Write an argument about the results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for letting me review an article with the title of Audit of employment nursing Care Standards before Coronary Angiography in Patients Referred to Angiography Departments of Hospitals affiliated to Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences in 1389. There are some comments about this manuscript that authors should correct before publication.
Abstract:
- You should more explain about your findings especially demographics data and write P-values
Introduction:
- Please add international findings that support necessarily of this study
Methods:
- Please write about sampling method and sample volume.
- Write ethical consideration.
Results:
- Please correct grammatical errors. you should words that is common in research study.
- Bring a demographic table
- Please combine number and percent of each column as: number(percent)
- Please write about P-values and additional information in a tables.
Discussion:
- Please do not write title of other studies in discussion.
- Write the limitation of study.
- Please write more about the conclusion and novelty of your study.
- Please organize your manuscript based on JJCDC guideline.
- Write conflict of interest
- Funding
- Authorship
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments the article needs some revisions in all parts.
With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript in JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I recommend you revise manuscript and turn back as soon as possible.
With regards.

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.

Hi, editor of jundishapur journal of chronic disease care

First of all, I want to thank you and dear reviewer for scientific comment for our article.

The authors of the article try to respond to all comments that afforded by reviewers. All contents are changed is detected by yellow color

First reviewer

1- *In title employment omitted*
2- *Article is arranged by the foundation of journal*

3-The abstract is changed and try to write finding of the research is better

4- Article is revised by a native English language
5- introduction supported by new and international finding
6- in the discussion we could not find parallel study but argument in this section augmented
7- in the finding a lot of information about patients don't associated to the subject of study are omitted
8- the material and method of study is written again

the second reviewer

article is revised by a native English language

abstract of study is revised

results are revised

demographic table is adding to results

sampling and the formulation of sample is adding

Article is arranged by the foundation of journal

introduction supported by new and international finding

the material and method of study is written again

ethical number is adding to context

limitation, financial support and conflict of authors are adding to article

Article is arranged by the foundation of journal

P vale and additional information add to table

Yours sincerely

Corresponding author of article

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 23 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
All comments were done. But all numbers in table 2 and in the title is in Persian!! 1389!!. or 2012? in my opinion there is not need to write year in your title. other example 3/8 % or 3.8% ? Please correct all number in English. Please write limitation end of discussion then conclusion then acknowledgment then fund, conflict of interest and authorship participation. Please correct your references all same format. for giving a example you can see our published articles on our website.
Thanks .

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 2 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should correct the manuscript based on journal guideline.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 2 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some extra things that the authors should correct. They write all number based on English format and our journal guidelines.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Please correct all comments and resubmits soon as possible.
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.

Hi, editor of journal

First of all, we want thank of the notable comments of reviewers

The comments of revisers are applied and detected with yellow color

1- Year omitted from title
2- Percentage correct
3- The steps of the details discussion arrange base on the journal structure
4- Total of article arranged base on the journal format

Corresponding author

Dr. salehitali

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.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Apr 2020

Dear Author,

This Manuscript in the current format is ready for publication.

With the Best