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.111160
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: In Press(In Press); e111160

Peer Review Report for "Seasonal Variations of Heart Failure and Acute Coronary Syndrome in a Referral Center of Heart Diseases in Ahvaz, Southwest of Iran"

Author(s): Farzaneh Ahmadi, Parisa Pourkhosravi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 29 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 1 Feb 2021

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)

3 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. In the abstract, the necessity of the study and the conclusion should be corrected. Extract keywords from the MESH.
2. Explain about heart failure in the introduction. Use relevant findings to explain the necessity of the study.
3. Write relationship in the objective instead of the effect.
4. In the methodology, write the code of ethics.
5. On line 143, write P- Value.
6. Write the discussion more carefully. Write the commentary on lines 207 to 213 using references.
7. Explain the limitations of the research.
8. In Table 1, what variables are related to the comparison? In Table 2, if a comparison is made, the table title needs to be modified. Why is there only one P-Value for the three variables in this table? Tables seem to need serious modification.
9. Use software Endnote in writing references. References are updated.

Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 14 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to the JJCDC. There are some comments in my opinion for the authors.
- Please Check keywords with MeSH and revise them.
- Of 4,041 patients, 625, 2,410, and 1,006 patients were hospitalized. Re-write numbers. I could not understand the first time. For example HF (625 patients), angina (2.410 patients)
- This study is well written.
- Mention limitations of the study.
- Mention ethic code.
- Use new references.
Thank you so much again

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 14 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on our reviewers comments, this manuscript needs some revision in al parts. The authors should revise their manuscript based on JJCDC guideline.
Thank you

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 14 Jan 2021

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 that 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.

26/01/2021

Dear Editor-in-Chief

The reviewers' comments were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages, there are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewers.

Reviewer: 1

- **Comment 1:** *In the abstract, the necessity of the study and the conclusion should be corrected. Extract keywords from the MESH.*
- **Answer1:** It was corrected. Keywords were extracted from *MESH*.
- **Comment 2:** *Explain about heart failure in the introduction. Use relevant findings to explain the necessity of the study.*
- **Answer 2: They were done.**
  3. Write relationship in the objective instead of the effect.

  Answer 3: It was done.
  4. In the methodology, write the code of ethics.

  Answer 4: It was done.

  5. On line 143, write P- Value.

  Answer 5: It was done.

  6. Write the discussion more carefully. Write the commentary on lines 207 to 213 using references.

  Answer 6: They were done.

  7. Explain the limitations of the research.

  Answer 7: It was done.
  8. In Table 1, what variables are related to the comparison? In Table 2, if a comparison is made, the table title needs to be modified. Why is there only one P-Value for the three variables in this table? Tables seem to need serious modification.

  Answer 8: Table 1 was corrected. Table 2 was modified and revised.

.

9. Use software Endnote in writing references. References are updated.

Answer 9: References were written using software Endnote and updated.

Reviewer 2

Comment 1: *Reviewer 2:* ***Please Check keywords with MESH and revise them.***

Answer1: Keywords were extracted from *MESH*.

Comment 2: ***Of 4,041 patients, 625, 2,410, and 1,006 patients were hospitalized. Re-write numbers. I could not understand in the first time. For example: HF (625 patients), angina (2.410 patients).***

Answer 2: This sentence was revised and re-written.
Comment 3: ***Mention limitations of study.***
Answer 3: This section was added to the manuscript.
Comment 4: ***Mention ethic code.***
Answer 4: This section was added to the manuscript.
Comment 5: ***Use new references.***
Answer 5: Fifteen new references were added to the manuscript.

On behalf of the authors

Yours' sincerely,

Farzaneh_Ahmadi

Corresponding Author

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.

simin Jahani: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The desired corrections have been made. The article is acceptable.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript in the current format is acceptable.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 1 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
This manuscript in the current format is acceptable for publishing.
With the best.