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.106131
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(4); e106131

# Peer Review Report for "Estimation of $PM_{2.5}$ Pollutant and Risk of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) in Ahvaz, Iran"

**Author(s):** Elahe Zallaghi, Gholamreza Goudarzi, Sima Sabzalipour, Alireza Zarasvandi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 11 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 29 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

**Mohammad javad Mohammadi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
- The manuscript needs some revision.
- The title of this study should be modify.
- ABSTRACT: abstract is adequate.
- The keywords seem to be general and should be revised based on MESH.
- Introduction: The introduction section should be revised, chiefly page 3. line 3-5 Today, the unfavorable …….
- The name of study should be brought in methods section.
- Result: Carefully check that all Tables.
- In the section Discussion Please highlight your study's strengths and limitations.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
- Materials and Methods: A PM2.5 data calculated?
- Materials and Methods: Ethics Committee of transfer materials and methods section.

- Materials and Methods: Please define the abbreviation.
- Result: Carefully check that all Tables.
- Discussion: The Discussion section must be improved.
- Conclusion: there is differing between conclusion of abstract and full text.

Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jul 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) 5 Jul 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts. I recommend you revise the manuscript and get it 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.

**Dear Dr. Kourosh Zarea | Editor-in-Chief | Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care:**

Thank you for your useful comments and suggestions on the language and the structure of our manuscript. We have modified the manuscript accordingly, and detailed corrections are listed below, point by point. According to the revision proposed by the editor and reviewer all items listed were reviewed and corrected.

All the best,

Thank you for your kind collaboration,

Dr Sima Sabzalipour

**Reply to the reviewers' comments in article**

| Reviewer Number | Original comments of the reviewer | Reply by the author(s) | Changes done on manuscript |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| 1 | - The title of this study should be modify. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have revised title. | **Estimation of $PM_{2.5}$ Pollutant and Risk of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) in Ahvaz, Iran** |
| 1 | - ABSTRACT: abstract is adequate. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. | |
| 1 | - Your key words seem to be general and should be revised based on MESH. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have revised title. | **Keywords:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, Urban air pollution, Relative Risk, Ahvaz. |
| 1 | - Introduction: The introduction section should be revised, chiefly page 3. line 3-5 Today, the unfavorable ……... | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have revised introduction page 3. line 3-5. | **Introduction** |
| 1 | - The name of study should be brought in methods section. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We add the name of study. | **3. Method**<br><br>In this descriptive cross-sectional study, estimating the time changes of pollutants, epidemiological, and using the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | model during the ten-year period (2008-2017) in Ahvaz for $PM_{2.5}$ pollutants. |
| 1 | - Result: Carefully check that all Tables. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. | **Tables** |
| 1 | - Result: Please define the abbreviation. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have add the define the abbreviation. | **Manuscript** |
| 1 | - In the section Discussion Please highlight your study's strengths and limitations. | Thank you for your useful comments, we have add strengths and limitations. | **Limitations and strengths**<br><br>The major limitations this study include the limitations of ecological studies which is the use of aggregated data. Observed trends may not be representing a wider population because of this study had a small sample size. It should be noted that, future larger studies are required to verify the observed trends, to perform sub-group analyses and further time period. |
| | | | |
| 2 | - Materials and Methods: A PM2.5 data what calculated? | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. | $PM_{2.5}$ data from organizations of Environmental Protection and Meteorology and mortality data attributed to COPD outcomes for adults over 30 years were gathered from the Deputy of Health of Khuzestan province. Exposure COPD outcomes with $PM_{2.5}$ were surveyed by the AirQ+ model. Data validation was investigated by WHO criteria. Based on this, four stations (Naderi, Mohit Zist, Behdasht Ghadim and Havashenasi) were elected, which include more than 50% of the valid data per year and index of population exposure. After validating the $PM_{2.5}$ pollutant |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | data, the average of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, seasonal, and annual for $PM_{2.5}$ changes were calculated and by entering the annual $PM_{2.5}$ pollutant data and attributed to population contact, the COPD outcome in AirQ+ software has been applied for ten-years in connection with its health effects. Population contact data per 100000 population, including the population at risk, BI, and RR for COPD outcomes are shown in Table 1 for the study period. Attributable proportion, the number of cases attributable per 100000 people at-risk (BE), and the total number of cases attributable to the exposure (NE) are amongst the most important cases in the software output table. |
| 2 | - Materials and Methods: Ethics Committee of transfer materials and methods section. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have transfer Ethics Committee of transfer to materials and methods section. | The authors are to acknowledge the Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz Branch, Meteorological Organizations, Department of Health and cure, and Environmental Protection Agency of Khuzestan province for their cooperation in obtaining the required data. |
| 2 | - Materials and Methods: Please define the abbreviation. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. We have add the define the abbreviation. | **Manuscript** |
| 2 | - Result: Carefully check that all Tables. | Thank you for your useful comments the respectable referee. | **Tables** |
| 2 | - Discussion: The Discussion section must be improved. | Thank you for your useful comments, we have revised discussion. | **Discussion** |
| 2 | - Conclusion: there is differing between conclusion of abstract and full text. | Thank you for your useful comments, we have revised conclusion. | **Conclusion** |
| | | | |

**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) 14 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript can be ACCEPTED for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current format, just need to add guideline of the journal about ethical code, author contribution, conflict of interest, and fund of study that should be written end of the manuscript.
Thanks

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. your manuscript in the current format is acceptable but you should mention all article parts based on our guideline before final publication. it includes:
- Acknowledgement
- Author contribution
- Ethical consideration
- Conflict of interest
- Fund of study

Thank you very much for your collaboration.