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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.100583
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(2); e100583

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence of Seasonal Influenza Vaccination in Pregnant Women Referring to Tertiary Hospitals of Kerman, Iran"

Author(s): Mehran Nakhaeizadeh, Solmaz Bahar, Ali Khalooei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	30 Dec 2019
Revised Date:	26 Jan 2020
Accepted Date:	26 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

Behnam Honarvar: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should consider points that were asked on the PDF of your manuscript. After the appropriate revision, it may be accepted as a brief report.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 12 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Revision is needed according to the reviewers' points. After wanted revisions, the manuscript may be accepted as a brief report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above

carefully according to reviewers' request.

Thanks.

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 reviewer, we would like to thank for your valuable comments.

1- Reviewer comment: Among pregnant women who referred to a tertiary hospital of Kerman, Iran

Response: The title was corrected according to the comment. Page 1

2- Reviewer comment: the comorbidity

Response: "the" was omitted. Page 1

3- Reviewer comment: Among pregnant women who referred to a tertiary hospital of Kerman, Iran

Response: The title was corrected according to the comment. Page 2

4- Reviewer comment: this infection

Response: "this" was added. Page 1

5- Reviewer comment: a very wide CI?

Response: influenza vaccination rate in women who did not receive the recommendation to influenza vaccine uptake was much lower (0.7) compared to women who received the recommendation (63.9). Therefore, the CI is very wide.

6- Reviewer comment: Why didn't applied random sampling?

Response: the study population was women who attended in two referral clinics. Majority of them were referred from primary health centers. Therefore, the study population was a dynamic population and there was no sampling frame for random sampling.

7- Reviewer comment: Define the trimester of recruited pregnant women?

Response: According to Iranian influenza guideline all pregnant women regardless of gestational age should receive seasonal influenza vaccine. So the women were recruited in the study regardless of their gestational age.

8- Reviewer comment: please check the ethical code. We did not find it in the national ethic's registration system,

Response: Ethics codes after 1397 were entered in the national ethic's registration system by Kerman university of Medical Sciences.

9- Reviewer comment: Which chronic diseases?

Response: underlying chronic disease such as diabetes, cardiovascular diseases and chronic respiratory diseases. We added in the text. Page3.

10- Reviewer comment: different

Response: the word was corrected

11- Reviewer comment: Which questions did you asked? Show them in a separated table.

Response: thank you so much for this valuable comment. We added a table to show the questions (table 2 in Page9, and related text in page3)

12- Reviewer comment: lack of receiving a recommendation to inf. vaccination or recommendation to not vaccinate?
Response: This sentence was corrected as: Also, the most common reason to not receive influenza vaccine was lack of receiving a recommendation to influenza vaccination (75.8) page 4)

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.

Behnam Honarvar: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 23 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the corrections, however we again did not find the identified ethiics code on the national ethics committee registry site. Please check it again.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.