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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.106830
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(8); e106830

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Environmental Modifications on Improving the Sleep Quality of the Elderly Hospitalized in the Cardiac Care Unit"

Author(s): Masoumeh Shohani, Sanaz Azami, Hossein Seidkhani, Zeinab Gholami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 17 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Aug 2020

Revision (0)

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

Babak Amra: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 20 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
- The subject of poor sleep quality in old age admitted in CCU is interesting.
- But only using one sleep questionnaire in small sample size is inappropriate.
- The conclusion of manuscript is also well known.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Having gone through this report I can suggest its publication after revisions. The authors can find the below comments:
1. Though the idea of evaluating sleep quality measures in CCU-admitted subjects is worthwhile, subjective measures based on PSQI seem to only provide preliminary and not

necessarily consistent data. Instead, objective assessments through polysomnography and discussing the arousability index in sleep EEG would provide way better empirical insights. As such, authors are suggested to discuss this limitation in their study before conclusion and cite/discuss related PSG-included research in the discussion part.
2. Please provide an additional table to also cross-correlate cardiac/disease-related variable changes if any (CCU-stay days, cardiac arrhythmias, overall wellbeing, need for antianginal medications, BP, etc) following environment modification and the resultant gained sleep quality. In case such data is not available, please discuss this under a header: future directions.
3. Language needs a thorough revision by a native speaker with a biomedical background. In many instances language flaws hinder readability.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should cite the validated Persian version of PSQI that they used in their study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Jul 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.

Journal:	Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Manuscript ID:	106830
Title:	The effect of environmental modifications on improving sleep quality of elderly hospitalized in cardiac care unit
Revision:	[0]

Dear Mrs. zeinab gholami,

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to our journal. We would like to inform you that the peer review process of your manuscript is complete and requires "**Major Revision**". Although it has several useful points, it needs **Major Revision** to be reviewed again. Below you can find the abstracts of the peer review decision made by our editorial board members.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Editor
Esteemed SEMJ
Thanks for sharing the Manuscript No 106830 for review.

Having gone through this report I can suggest its publication after revisions. Please find the below comments:
1. Though the idea of evaluating sleep quality measures in CCU-admitted subjects is worthwhile, subjective measures based on PSQI seem to only provide preliminary and not necessarily consistent data. Instead, objective assessments through polysomnography and discussing the arousability index in sleep EEG would provide way better empirical insights. As such, authors are suggested to discuss this limitation in their study before conclusion and cite/discuss related PSG-included research in the discussion part.

However, today there are good advances in measuring sleep quality. For example, both subjective ~~measures~~ (e.g. self-report instruments) and objective ~~measures~~ (e.g. laboratory methods such as polysomnography and actigraphy)measures (11-12)~~,are~~ can beused to measure the quality of sleep~~, the use of these methods is done~~ for various purposes. Obviously, using a combination of the above-mentioned methods will give better results. The aim of the present study was to determine the effects of environmental modifications on sleep

quality in the elderly hospitalized in the CCU ward of Shahid Mostafa Khomeini Hospital of Ilam, Iran in 2018.

2. Please provide an additional table to also cross-correlate cardiac/disease related variable changes if any (CCU-stay days, cardiac arrhythmias, overall wellbeing, need for antianginal medications, BP etc) following environment modification and the resultant gained sleep quality. In case such data is not available, please discuss this under a header: future directions.

However, in this study and similar studies, tools such as the Pittsburgh Questionnaire were have beenused to measure determine sleep quality. These tools which only measuresthe patient's' subjective state by self-assessment. Nevertheless, , the measurement will be more accurate by usingobjective methods. While ThePSG is generally considered to be the gold standard for diagnosingto diagnose sleep-related breathing disorders (, which include obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), central sleep apnea, and sleep-related hypoventilation/hypoxia), but it . PSG can also be utilized to evaluate for other sleep disorders, including nocturnal seizures, narcolepsy, periodic limb movement disorder, and rapid eye movement sleep behavior disorder (23).

Recommendations and limitations

This work is a result of a Msc. thesis in nursing. So, because of time limitations, it was not feasible to conduct objective assessments (such as polysomnography). Also, some keywords (CCU-stay days, cardiac arrhythmias, overall wellbeing, need for antinational medications, BP etc.) were not included in the literature search to avoid so many results. Another limitation was small sample size. Considering these limitations, it is recommended to perform another study to address these shortcomings.

3. Language needs a thorough revision by a native speaker with a biomedical background. In many instances language flaws hinder readability.

The entire text of the article was rewritten in terms of writing and science

Reviewer 2:

Dear Authors

The subject of poor sleep quality in old age admitted in CCU is interesting.

But only using one sleep questionnaire in small sample size is inappropriate.

The conclusion of manuscript is also well known.

Recommendations and limitations

This work is a result of a Msc. thesis in nursing. So, because of time limitations, it was not feasible to conduct objective assessments (such as polysomnography). Also, some keywords (CCU-stay days, cardiac arrhythmias, overall wellbeing, need for antinational medications, BP etc.) were not included in the literature search to avoid so many results. Another limitation was small sample size. Considering these limitations, it is recommended to perform another study to address these shortcomings.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The authors should cite the validated Persian version of PSQI that they used in their study.

EIC Decision:

Major revision is needed.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 20 Aug 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.