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.106392
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(8); e106392

Peer Review Report for "Equity in the Distribution of Health Resources: A Case Study in Southeast Iran"

Author(s): Mohammad Khammarnia, Hesam Ghiasvand, Fateme Javadi, Fatemeh Safdari Adimi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 11 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 13 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.

Heshmatollah Asadi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 27 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
This is the result of the review on manuscript “106392”
• The article needs further editing for the English language.
• Keywords are not selected from "Mesh".
• Introduction needs to be reviewed.
• Discussion needs to be reviewed.
• The discussion (in conclusion) appears quite weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages.
• Study limitations are not presented.
• The conclusion in the abstract and in the article is not adequately supported by the findings. It needs to be rewritten based on the findings.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 28 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The scope of the study is an important issue in the field of healthcare, However, I believe the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points:

Title:

• Please change the title, the title of the article is very journalistic.

Abstract

• In method: explain about dimension of checklist.

• In keywords: write keywords based on MeSH system

Method

• Complete the method of research (population and sampling, tools, analysis method and software,…)

Result

• Please draw a variable Lorenz curve if possible.

Conclusion

• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. State clearly how you solved the limitations of the study.

• The Conclusion needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages

References:

• Some of the used references are very old and so needs to be updated.

• Please correct in accordance with the guidelines of journal

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Aug 2020

Dear AE,

Comments for the authors:

• In method part of abstract, the study is a cross-sectional study. A retrospective study should be changed to cross sectional study.

• What is the meaning of “behvars”? Use “health worker” instead of “behvars” or other words.

• In section method, rewrite this sentence: “In order to data analyzing, for analyzing, the data were entered into Excel software.”

• “Table1: Number of human resources and active bed divided by each health networks affiliated of ZAUMS” , “affiliated of ZAUMS “ should be changed to: “affiliated to ZAUMS”

• In the context, you wrote “sib soran” but in the table you wrote “sib saravan”

• In table 1, you wrote “!9” in nurse column. Reform it.

• In table 1, for sib saravan that data weren’t available you used two form abbreviations “N/A , N?A” use a uniform abbreviation.

• “maximum and lowest population”!!!!! , use the suit antonym words: highest and lowest population or maximum and minimum population

• What are the criteria for “appropriate conditions” or “good conditions”

• How did you calculate “Gini coefficient index”. Please explain it.

• Recheck the Gini coefficient index. I think it’s wrong.

• The title of figure 2 is wrong. Reform it.

• Where is the Lorenz curve?

• The references aren’t sufficient.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

4 Sep 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.

Reviewer 1:
• In method part of abstract, the study is a cross sectional study. A retrospective study should be changed to cross sectional study.

This be done
• What is the meaning of “behvars”? Use “health worker” instead of “behvars” or other words.
The word Behvarz replaced by “rural health worker”, although Behvarz is a national and popular name in Iran and EMRO region.
• In section method, rewrite this sentence: “In order to data analyzing, for analyzing, the data were entered into Excel software.”

It be done
• “Table1: Number of human resources and active bed divided by each health networks affiliated of ZAUMS” , “affiliated of ZAUMS “ should be changed to: “affiliated to ZAUMS”

The title of Tables and Figure be revised.
• In the context, you wrote “sib soran” but in the table you wrote “sib saravan”

The name of city be corrected.
• In table 1, you wrote “!9” in nurse column. Reform it.

The table 1, be corrected.
• In table 1, for sib saravan that data weren’t available you used two form abbreviation “N/A , N? A” use a uniform abbreviation. The table 1, be corrected
• “maximum and lowest population”!!!!! , use the suit antonym words: highest and lowest population or maximum and minimum population.

It be done and revised.
• What are the criteria for “appropriate conditions” or “good conditions”

The text be revised.
• How did you calculate “Gini coefficient index”. Please explain it.

Gini coefficient be explained in method section.
• Recheck the Gini coefficient index. I think it’s wrong.

Gini coefficient be checked in text.
• The title of figure 2 is wrong. Reform it.

The title of Tables and Figure be revised.
• Where is the Lorenz curve?

Lorenz curve had removed.
• The references aren’t sufficient.

References were updated and six references be added.

Reviewer 2:
This is the result of the review on manuscript “106392”
• The article need further editing for English language.

The manuscript was revised by a native English language expert.
• Keywords are not selected from "Mesh".

Keywords rewrite based on Mesh.
• Introduction needs to be reviewed.

Introduction be revised.
• Discussion needs to be reviewed.

Discussion be revised
• The discussion (in conclusion) appears quite weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages.

Discussion was rewriting and used of new reference for improvement.
• Study limitations are not presented.

Study limitations be added.
• The conclusion in abstract and in the article is not adequately supported by the findings. It needs to be rewritten based on the findings.

Conclusion be revised and rewritten based in the findings

Reviewer 3:
Minor Revision
Dear Authors;
The scope of the study is an important issue in the field of healthcare, However, I believe the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points:
Abstract
• In method: explain about dimension of checklist.

It be done in method section.
• In keywords: write key words based on MeSH system

Keywords were rewrite based on Mesh.
Method

• Complete the method of research (population and sampling, tools, analysis method and software ,…)

The method section be revised.

Result

• Please draw a variable Lorenz curve if possible.

Conclusion

• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. State clearly how you solved the limitations of the study.

Limitations of the study be added.

• The Conclusion needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages

conclusion be revised.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Most comments have been done. Only please change the title, the title of the article is very journalistic.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 8 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Dear Editor,

I would like to thank you.

According to the comment, the title of the manuscript be revised to "Equity in Distribution of Health Care Resources: A Case Study in Southeast of Iran"

Best,

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 13 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.