Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 4 · e140108

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Structural Equation Modeling of Treatment Adherence Based on General Health and Demographic Characteristics in Patients Undergoing Hemodialysis

Mahmoud Movahedi, Batool Nehrir, Malihe Sadat Moayed, Masoud Sirati Nir

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Aug 2023	4 Oct 2023	17 Oct 2023	10.5812/numonthly-140108

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** Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

1 comment · 8 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 8 Sep 2023

Major 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.

In the Name of Almighty

Dear Reviewer

We sincerely appreciate the time and effort you have put into your comments on our manuscript (NO. 140108). It was your valuable and insightful comments that led to possible improvements in the current version. We have carefully reviewed the comments and thoroughly revised the manuscript accordingly. All modifications have been highlighted in yellow.

Revision: [1]

Reviewer Comments	*Responding to Reviewer Comments*
1. Several grammatical errors among the text should be corrected, please recheck the main text (especially discussion section).	**Response:** Regarding the native editing of English by the official institution whose certificate is attached, please indicate the grammatical errors so that it can be corrected by the institution.
Abstract *2. Please sort the keywords alphabetically and check them with MeSH terms.*	**Response:** Thanks for your kind reminder. The keywords were sorted alphabetically and checked with MeSH terms (Line no. 23).
Methods *3. A research/study checklist needs to be provided based on your study type (EQUATOR network could be a source for this purpose).*	**Response:** Thank you for your nice reminder. We provided a readily available STROBE checklist to ensure a clear presentation of what was planned and conducted in our observational study (Lines no. 69-70).
Results *4.This section should be more comprehensive, specifically Tables 3 and 4 was not expressed in result section.*	**Response:** We apologize for this mistake. We apologize for this mistake. We were explained tables 3 and 4 in the results section (Lines no.131-136 , 143-145 and 147).
Conclusion *5. Numbering and the title of this section is out of standard format.*	**Response:** The numbering and title of this section are the same as the archive articles of 2022 and 2023 in this Journal .
References *6. Reference 29 is out of format, please reformat it.*	**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. The format of reference 29 was corrected (Lines no.366-369).
Figures and tables *7. If it's possible please provide a p-value column in tables.*	**Response:** Thank you for the suggestion. We added a p-value column in tables (Lines no. 363-364).
8. Figure 2 resolution is so low that I cannot see anythings of it, consider improving it.	**Response:** Thank you very much for the reminder. The resolution of Figure 2 has been improved (Lines no.271-272).
9. The caption of figure 2 should be expanded for better understanding.	**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. According to the comment, the caption of Figure 2 was expanded for better understanding (Lines no. 273-275).
10. Table 3 contents should be rearranged.	**Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. The contents of Table 3 were rearrange (Lines no.253-258).
11. All the tables should have a uniform appearance for the publication.	**Response:** We appreciate the encouraging comments. We have made uniformed appearance of all the tables (Lines no.249-264).

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 29 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 29 Sep 2023

Minor Revision

3

Revision 2

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.

In the Name of Almighty

Dear Reviewer

We greatly appreciate the Reviewer's positive comments on our manuscript (NO. 140108). We have carefully reviewed the comments and thoroughly revised the manuscript accordingly. All modifications have been highlighted in yellow.

Revision: [2]

Reviewer Comments	***Responding to Reviewer Comments***
1- The STROBE checklist is not within the submitted files and I don't have access to read it. Please submit it as supplementary files for review	**Response:** Thank you for your nice reminder. We attached a readily available STROBE checklist to ensure a clear presentation of what was planned and conducted in our observational study.
2- As I mentioned before, the quality (resolution) of Figure 2 needs improvements, with a little zoom on the photo, the contents turn blurry.	**Response:** Thank you for the suggestion. The resolution of Figure 2 has been improved (Lines no.274-293).

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 15 Oct 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Oct 2023

Accept