Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 2 · Issue 1 · e144506

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluating Persian Websites that Provide Information About Chronic Diseases

Hossein Ghalavand, Roghayeh Eskrootchi, Sedigheh Khani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 Jan 2024	19 May 2024	28 May 2024	10.5812/chbs-144506

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** saeid shirshahi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** saeid shirshahi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

3 comments · 15 May 2024 – 17 May 2024

saeid shirshahi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2024

- Subject
- 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes
- 2) Does the article have novelty? Yes
- Title
- 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? Yes
- 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No
- Abstract
- 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes
- 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes
- Introduction
- 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes
- 8) Does the Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? Yes
- Materials And Methods
- 9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?
- In the study's method section, the criteria for selecting researchers and medical specialists should be clearly explained.
- 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? Yes
- 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes
- 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population? Yes
- 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? Yes
- 14) Control Subjects Appropriate? Yes
- 15) Power of study declared? Yes
- 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes
- 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?
- 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?
- 19) Identify the methods and apparatus (give the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses)?
- 20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results? Yes
- 21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?
- 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?
- 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes
- Results
- 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes
- 25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes
- 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No
- 27) Use statistical technical terms in a nontechnical sense, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample”? No
- Discussion
- 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes
- 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes
- References

- 30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes
- 31) References for the last five years? NO (The references used are indeed appropriate)

The research has been conducted effectively, and the article is deemed acceptable with minor corrections. Please find the desired comments for correction below:
Comments:
In the study's method section:
1- Please mention the software version used (SPSS).
2- Enter the date on which the search was performed.
3- Explain the selection criteria for participants, including researchers and physicians.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 16 May 2024

minor revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 17 May 2024

This article needs 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.

Reviewer 1

Comment 1: References for the last five years? NO	**Response 1:** Based on the reviewer's opinion, new references find and insert in different section of manuscript especially in background and discussions.
Comment 2: Please mention the software version used (SPSS).	**Response 2:** Based on the reviewer's opinion, the version of statistical software mentioned (spss version 21), in abstract and methods.
Comment 3: Enter the date on which the search was performed	Based on the reviewer's opinion, authors explained that “the search was conducted between July 18 and August 28, 2022” (in method section).
Comment 4: Explain the selection criteria of participants, including researchers and physicians.	Based on the reviewer's opinion, authors writing below sentences about participant including criteria. (in method section) The researchers have expertise in library and medical information and have previously published article(s) on the topic of evaluating online health information resources. Only physicians who met the following criteria were invited to participate in this study: 1) Iranian physicians with at least one year of experience in the medical profession. 2) Active Iranian physicians that use internet and social media to share health information with colleagues or patients.

.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 23 May 2024 – 28 May 2024

saeid shirshahi Reviewer

ACCEPT 23 May 2024

The successful incorporation of all suggested comments and the requisite corrections have been diligently executed, rendering the article poised for publication.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 26 May 2024

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 28 May 2024

Accepted