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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.105821
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: In Press(In Press); e105821

Peer Review Report for "Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of General Practitioners Toward the Rehabilitation Field and Team Experts in Shiraz, Iran, in 2018"

Author(s): Hamid Reza Farpour, Maryam Kazemi, Kayvon Seyed Dehghanian, Mojdeh Moradi, Sima Farpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 May 2020
Revised Date: 25 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Nov 2020

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) 10 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. In Table 1 also compare knowledge and practice in different subgroups.
2. Appendix 1 is not about correlation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. As a whole, I think the analysis of the paper is well done however the paper contains a lot of methodological and grammatical errors making it complicated to follow and does not meet standards for publication. A major recommendation is that the paper needs extensive revisions and English language editing before it can be published. Below are some comments for the authors regarding improving the quality of the paper:

Abstract:

1. I thinks you must use "Physical medicine and Rehabilitation (PMR)" instead of rehabilitation field through the manuscript. Because rehabilitation field comprises a range of disciplines, which not mentioned in your study.
2. You can use "team working" instead of "team experts"
3. Please remove this sentence "A total of 200…" from the end of methods section and insert in at results section as main manuscript.
4. In conclusion, you say "Iran", while this study has been conducted in Shiraz!

Introduction:

1. Please revise it overall in order to better internal consistency.
2. Please use "Prosthetists and Orthotists" instead of "technical orthopedics".
3. Please add "social workers" and "psychologists" before Ref. 2.
4. Please insert the abbreviated form of "quality of life".
5. Please abbreviated form of "general physicians"
6. I think you should use "primary health care" instead of "primary care".
7. I think "complications" is better than "conditions" before Ref. 8.

Study design:

1. Please revise "… public and private sectors of…" as "public and private health sectors…"
2. Please remove this sentence "A total of 200…" from this section.
3. Please specify the trained researcher. For instance, insert the initial letter of name.
4. Explanation of the study When was it done? Before sending the questionnaire or with the questionnaire?
5. Did you have any dropouts? If you had, please describe the numbers plus the reason.
6. Please provide the results of validity and reliability phase.

Ethical considerations:

1. Please insert the name of university.
2. Please insert the Code No.
3. When written informed consent form was achieved?

Statistical analysis:

1. Please use "New York" instead of "NY"
2. Please insert "Standard Deviation" before "SD"
3. What is your evidence of rationale for use tertiles for each section?

Results:

This section is too scattered and unstructured. Please rewrite it.

Discussion:

1. The first sentence is not along with the aim of the study.
2. Please insert the explained from of "EMG-NCV".
3. Modalities for occupational therapy?? Did you consider for physiotherapy as well??
4. Please "MS" after "multiple sclerosis"
5. This sentence "… while our study" is not correct in accordance with previous sentence.
6. Please insert Reference after "… medical school curricula"
7. Please remove the results and statistical findings from discussion section.
8. Before Ref. 17, although you have said "we noticed…", you use Ref. 17.
9. Please insert Reference after this sentence "… a visit by a physiatrist"
10. Please add a separate section as limitations, and be more clearly about your limitations.

Conclusion:
This section needs to be revised in accordance with the main aim of the study.
References:
Please correct the references based on the Journal Reference Style.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 9 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
before considering the manuscript for publication, authors should:
1- Please edit the text by a native editor.
2- Respond to the comments(two attached files and one comment by a statistician).
3- Total years of work experience as a physician (besides the experience as a family physician) seems to be very important, so include this variable in the result section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Aug 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.

Reply to Reviewers' Letter

Title: **"Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of General Physicians toward the Rehabilitation Field and Team Experts in Shiraz, Iran, in 2018"**

Dear editors of the Journal of **SHIRAZ E-MEDICAL JOURNAL**

We are grateful for your kind consideration and appreciate the valuable recommendations to revise our manuscript entitled "**Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of General Physicians toward the Rehabilitation Field and Team Experts in Shiraz, Iran, in 2018**". We have tried to follow all the advice and attached the answers below. We would like to point out that the entire manuscript has been revised for better internal consistency and grammatical accuracy. References were also revised. We hope that these modifications are satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Hamid Reza Farpour,

Corresponding author

9/19/2020

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. As a whole, I think the analysis of the paper is well done however the paper contains a lot of methodological and grammatical errors making it complicated to follow and does not meet standards for publication. A major recommendation is that the paper needs extensive revisions and English language editing before it can be published. Below are some comments for improving the quality of the paper:

Abstract:

1. I thinks you must use "Physical medicine and Rehabilitation (PMR)" instead of rehabilitation field through the manuscript. Because rehabilitation field comprises a range of disciplines, which not mentioned in your study.

We have followed your recommendation and used PRM instead of the rehabilitation field throughout the manuscript whenever appropriate. However, we must point out that the questionnaire did include questions about the entire rehabilitation team such as speech therapists, occupational therapists, orthotists, and physiotherapists.

2. You can use "team working" instead of "team experts"

P1;L15 “team experts” was changed to “team working”. Highlighted in green.

3. Please remove this sentence "A total of 200…" from the end of methods section and insert in at results section as main manuscript.

P1;L21 Sentence was removed and added to the results section. Highlighted in green.

4. In conclusion, you say "Iran", while this study has been conducted in Shiraz!

P1;L27 The conclusions section was revised according to the results of the study. “Iran” was changed to “Shiraz, Iran”. Highlighted in green.

Introduction:

1. Please revise it overall in order to better internal consistency.

Introduction was revised for better internal consistency. Some sentences were deleted and rearranged. References were also revised.

2. Please use "Prosthetists and Orthotists" instead of "technical orthopedics".

P2;L12 “technical orthopedists” was changed to “prosthetists” and “orthotists”. Highlighted in green.

3. Please add "social workers" and "psychologists" before Ref. 2.

P2;L12 “social workers” and “psychologists” were added. Highlighted in green.

4. Please insert the abbreviated form of "quality of life".

P2;L16 The abbreviated form of quality of life (QoL) was added. Highlighted in green.

5. Please abbreviated form of "general physicians"

P2;L8 The abbreviated form of “general practitioner” (GP) was added and used throughout the manuscript. Highlighted in green.

6. I think you should use "primary health care" instead of "primary care".

P2;L8 “Primary care” was changed to “primary health care”. Highlighted in green.

7. I think "complications" is better than "conditions" before Ref. 8.

P2;L10 “Conditions” was changed to “complications”

Study design:

1. Please revise "… public and private sectors of…" as "public and private health sectors…"

P3;L4-5 “Public and private sectors of healthcare” was changed to “ public and private health sectors”. Highlighted in green.

2. Please remove this sentence "A total of 200…" from this section.

P5;L17 Sentence was removed and included in the results section. Highlighted in green.

3. Please specify the trained researcher. For instance, insert the initial letter of name.

P3;L10 Initials were removed in order to blind the manuscript. The trained researcher was Dr. Mojdeh Moradi who is one of the authors. Her initials were added as “Dr. M.M.”. Highlighted in green.

4. Explanation of the study When was it done? Before sending the questionnaire or with the questionnaire?

Face and content validity and test-retest reliability surveys were done before sending the questionnaire to everyone in the sample population.

5. Did you have any dropouts? If you had, please describe the numbers plus the reason.

The study did not have any dropouts. We obtained written informed consent from each participant as part of the questionnaire. After retrieving all the questionnaires, we did not find any incomplete form.

6. Please provide the results of validity and reliability phase.

P3;L15-23, P5;L7-14 More information about the validity and reliability of the questionnaire was added to the Methods and Results sections. Highlighted in green.

Ethical considerations:

1. Please insert the name of university.

P4;L17-19 University name was removed to blind the study. It was added. Highlighted in green.

2. Please insert the Code No.

P4;L18-19 Study number and ethics approval codes were removed to blind the study. Per your recommendation they were added. Highlighted in green.

3. When written informed consent form was achieved?

P4;L19-20 Informed content was obtained as part of the questionnaire. This was added to the “Ethical considerations’ section for more clarity. Highlighted in green

Statistical analysis:

1. Please use "New York" instead of "NY"

P4;L23 “NY” was changed to “New York”. Highlighted in green.

2. Please insert "Standard Deviation" before "SD"

P4;L24 “Standard deviation” was added before abbreviation. Highlighted in green.

3. What is your evidence of rational for use tertiles for each section?

P4;L28-30 There is no standardized questionnaire available to measure the knowledge, attitudes, and practice toward physical medicine and rehabilitation. Few studies have been done on this subject with research-made questionnaires. Each study has used different scoring systems and a particular scores signifies different results in different studies. For the results to be objectively and qualitatively comparable to the results of other studies, the authors’ consensus was to divide the scores of the knowledge and attitudes section into three groups, high, average, and low, using the tertiles of the scores of each section as the cutoff. A sentence was added at the start of this paragraph to clarify the rational for using tertiles of the scores as the cutoff. Highlighted in green.

Results:

This section is too scattered and unstructured. Please rewrite it.

The results section was categorized and restructured for better clarity.

Discussion:

1. The first sentence is not along with the aim of the study.

P6;L29-30 This sentence was changed to better reflect the aim of the study. Highlighted in green.

2. Please insert the explained from of "EMG-NCV".

P6;L22-23 Electromyography and nerve conduction velocity was first used in the results section and the abbreviated form was presented. Highlighted in yellow.

3. Modalities for occupational therapy?? Did you consider for physiotherapy as well??

P8;L4-5 This sentence refers to the results of questions 9 and 11 of the knowledge part of the questionnaire. All of the participants had the knowledge that thermal modalities reduced chronic pain and 79.5% had acknowledged that occupational therapy improves quality of life in

traumatic injury patients. Therefore these were the best known topics in rehabilitation among general practitioners. The sentence was changed. Highlighted in green.

4. Please "MS" after "multiple sclerosis"

P8;L9 “MS” added after multiple sclerosis. Highlighted in green.

5. This sentence "… while our study" is not correct in accordance with previous sentence.

P7;L26-28 This sentence was changed. Highlighted in green.

6. Please insert Reference after "… medical school curricula"

This sentence was removed as part of the revision of the discussions section.

7. Please remove the results and statistical findings from discussion section.

The “discussions” section was revised. Statistical findings were removed from the discussions.

8. Before Ref. 17, although you have said "we noticed…", you use Ref. 17.

P7;L16 This sentence was revised. Highlighted in green.

9. Please insert Reference after this sentence "… a visit by a physiatrist"

P8;L22 Two references were added for this sentence. Highlighted in green.

10. Please add a separate section as limitations, and be more clearly about your limitations.

P8;L28-P9;L2 The manuscript included the study limitations as a “subheading”. The font changed to illustrate a “heading”. This part was also revised to better communicate the limitations of the study.

Conclusion:

This section needs to be revised in accordance with the main aim of the study.

P9;L8-12 This sections was revised and rewritten based on the findings of the study.

References:

Please correct the references based on the Journal Reference Style.

References were inserted using Endnote X9 and the style provided in the journal's "instruction for authors" page (Vancouver-Kowsar-2018). No change was made.

Reviewer 2:

1. In Table 1 also compare knowledge and practice in different sub groups.

T1 Per your recommendation, comparisons of the means of knowledge and attitudes scores in different subgroups were moved from Appendix 1. to Table 1. Highlighted in green.

2. Appendix 1 is not about correlation.

Appendix 1. was deleted and its data was included in Table 1. in the main manuscript.

Associate Editor:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear author

Before considering the manuscript for publication:

1. Please edit the text by a native editor.

Manuscript was edited by a native editor.

2. Respond to the comments (two attached files and one comments by a statistician).

We have responded to all the comments in this letter.

3. Total years of work experience as a physician (besides the experience as a family physician) seems to be very important, so include this variable in the result section.

P5;L19, T1 Years of work experience as a practitioner was added to the results section and Table 1. Highlighted in green.

4. Validity and reliability of questionnaire should be detailed more.

P3;L15-23, P5;L7-14 More information about the validity and reliability of the questionnaire was added to the Methods and Results sections. Highlighted in green.

5. Shiraz

P6;L29 Changed from “Iran” to “Shiraz, Iran”. Highlighted in green.

6. Average knowledge and attitudes

P6;L30 changed from “an average knowledge of and attitudes toward…” to “average knowledge and attitudes toward…”

7. Rewrite conclusions based on study findings.

P9;L8-12 This sections was revised and rewritten based on the findings of the study.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Most revisions are made but the authors still need to revise the manuscript according to the attached file. They should provide a response letter as well as highlight the manuscript changes for a better review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 13 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
There is a need for revision.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Reply to Reviewers' Letter

Title: **"Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of General Physicians toward the Rehabilitation Field and Team Experts in Shiraz, Iran, in 2018"**

Dear editors of the Journal of **SHIRAZ E-MEDICAL JOURNAL**

We are grateful for your kind consideration and appreciate the valuable recommendations to revise our manuscript entitled "**Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of General Physicians toward the Rehabilitation Field and Team Experts in Shiraz, Iran, in 2018**". We have tried to follow all the advice and attached the answers below. We have made some minor changes to the wording of some of the sentences for greater clarity (highlighted in purple). We hope that these modifications are satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Hamid Reza Farpour,

Corresponding author

10/23/2020

Associate Editor:

1- Provide N along with all percent all over the text.

P5:L17-23; P6:L5-23 The results section was revised to include both numbers (n) and percentages (%). Highlighted in green.

2- One of the reviewers commented that “In Table 1 also compare knowledge and practice in different sub groups.” You have compared the knowledge and attitude but practice was not compared. Also, you have omitted Appendix table. Please:

As mentioned in the methods section (P4:L12-14; Highlighted in yellow), the practice part of the questionnaire was not “scored” because the respondents had to rank the choices that were presented to them based on their preferences. The responses were then analyzed and reported in the results section (Table 4). For subgroup analysis of the practice section, each item had to be analyzed separately. Including all this data in the paper will result in a bulky table which will confuse the reader. However, as per your valuable recommendation, the subgroup analysis of the most important items of the practice section was included in the appendix section.

a. provide compare of different group by practice as well

A1. As per your recommendation, the subgroup analysis of the most important items of the practice section was included in the appendix section. Highlighted in green.

b. if it could not be included in table 1 , provide all comparisons in an appendix table.

A1. All comparisons of different subgroups were moved to the appendix section. Currently, Table 1 only shows the baseline features of the participants. Highlighted in green.

c. mention to the results of such compare in results section.

P6:L23-26 The most significant findings were mentioned in the results section. Highlighted in green.

d. had you a rationale for the compare or not? If yes discuss in discussion.

P7:L14-16 Findings were added to and discussed in the discussions section. Highlighted in green.

3- Provide N when you mention to %

P5:L17-23; P6:L5-23 The results section was revised to include both numbers (n) and percentages (%). Highlighted in green.

4- It is not per this study finding. Have you any result in which shows the CME is effective for familiarizing GPS to the PMR or even could encourage them?

P9:L12-18 The conclusions section was rewritten and revised to better reflect the findings of the study. Highlighted in green.

5- Complete the items.

T2; T3 Items in tables 2 and 3 were completed to prevent misunderstandings. Highlighted in green.

6- What does it mean? Do you mean: how much you are familiar about therapeutic injection?

T2; T3 Items in tables 2 and 3 were completed to prevent misunderstandings. Highlighted in green.

7- What is this? Complete this section till the end of the table2 or provide a complementary explanation in table footnotes.

T2; T3 Items in tables 2 and 3 were completed to prevent misunderstandings. Highlighted in green.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 21 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
All recommendations are addressed correctly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 22 Nov 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.