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.111491
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: In Press(In Press); e111491

Peer Review Report for "Knowledge, Performance, and Attitude Towards Mask Use to Prevent and Control COVID-19 Outbreak Among a Group of Iranian People: A Cross-sectional Study"

Author(s): Abdolhamid Tajvar, Teamur Aghamolaei, Shokrollah Mohseni, Anahita Fakherpour, Zabihollah Damiri, Mehdi Jahangiri, Hamidreza Ghaffari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 20 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 25 Mar 2021

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) — 24 Dec 2020

Dear AE
The authors should edit the manuscript according to the comments on the attached PDF. Moreover, updating of review of literature-founded evidences in the introduction and discussion parts is necessary.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Include time and location of the study in the abstract.
2. Report exact P-value in the abstract.
3. Report results of CVI and CVR. How about face and construct validity of the questionnaire?
4. Alpha Cronbach is not appropriate for correct/wrong questions.

5. Multiple linear regression is true.
6. Pearson is not a rank correlation.
7. Table 2 is not about correlation. It is about comparison.
8. Report exact P-value in the findings section.
Thanks

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Dec 2020

Dear EIC
The authors should revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 29 Dec 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 editor(s) and reviewers,

Thank you for your effort and valuable comments and suggestions. The authors have addressed all the comments point by point. The changes can be seen in the manuscript as highlighted in yellow. The responses to reviewers comment presented below:

Reviewer 1:

1. Include time and location of the study in the abstract.
   Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. The time and location of study were added to the abstracted and highlighted in yellow.
2. Report exact P-value in the abstract.
   Response: The exact P-value was reported in the text. Except for the following sentences, P-value of <0.05 (as significant level) was reported at the end of sentences because the results of more than two characteristics have been presented and its not possible to report exact P-value for each characteristic.
   "There were statistically significant differences among the participants' age, gender, educational levels, and job with the knowledge and attitude levels (P<0.05)."
3. Report results of CVI and CVR. How about face and construct validity of the questionnaire?
   Response: The number of experts surveyed for tool validity was eight. After sending the questionnaire to them and receiving their responses, the questions whose CVR was above 0.8 were selected and the final CVI of the questionnaire was found to be 0.85. These explanations were added to the text (**Materials and Methods: The Questionnaire Development process section)** as highlighted in yellow**.**
4. Alpha Cronbach is not appropriate for correct/wrong questions.
   Response: Our awareness questions are actually three options including **correct**, **wrong,** and **I do not know**. However, the score of the questions includes zero and one. Score of 1 assigned for questions with the answer of correct and score of zero was assigned for questions with the answer of wrong and I do not know. Of course, according to the following reference, even Cronbach's alpha can be used for two-choice questions.

Larry R. Price (2016) : Psychometric Methods Theory into Practice ,Guilford publication.

In addition to calculating the Cronbach's alpha index for awareness questions, the internal consistency index was also calculated by Richardson's Koder method, which was 0.831.

5. Multiple linear regression is true.
   Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. Multivariable Linear Regression (MLR) was changed to the Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) as highlighted in the text.
6. Pearson is not a rank correlation.
   Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. Pearson's rank correlation was changed to the Spearman's rank correlation.
7. Table 2 is not about correlation. It is about comparison.

   Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. The correlation was replaced with relationship.

8. Report exact P-value in the findings section
   Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. The exact P-value was reported in the text.

Reviewer 2:

1. Please, edit the manuscript according to the comments on the attached PDF. Moreover, updating of review of literature-founded evidences in the introduction and discussion parts is necessary.
   Response:. All the requested details were added to the text as highlighted in yellow. We discussed some new research in the introduction and discussion parts. The concepts were updated according to recent advances in disease prevention and treatment methods. All the grammatical and spelling mistakes were corrected and ambiguity sentences were wrote again. The other comments addressed point by point our responses to them are as follows.

2. All parts of introduction should be updated.

Response: The details of introduction including statistics and concepts were updated according to recent advances in disease prevention and treatment methods.

3. Where? on whom? when? how? you did the study? sample size? sampling method? all parts should be explained concisely here? number of questions in K,A,P?
   Response:

4. your scope of study was limited to Hormozgan province. if participants of other provinces were also among responders, define it in the method and result part.
   Response: This research project has been approved by Hormozgan University of Medical Sciences, but the study participants were from all provinces of Iran, and this issue is mentioned in the materials and methods section.

5. sample size? Detail of sampling method? How did you access to your target population? Type of on-line platform?
   Response: The designed electronic questionnaire was provided to the participants through social networks such as WhatsApp, Telegram, Instagram or email. The link of the questionnaire was sent to the relevant scientific groups to be provided to the participants. On the first page of the questionnaire, the necessary explanations were placed for the participants and the participants completed the questionnaire after agreeing to participate in the study. Porsline website (www.porsline.ir) was used to design the online questionnaire. A total of 1581 Iranian people took part in the study and completed the questionnaire which has mentioned in the text.

6. Some probable important other variables that may have association with Mask using were not studied; such as: cost of mask and ability to pay for it? or inaccessibility to mask? or ..... challanges of mask using?
   Response: We think these parameters could not affect on the response of participants to knowledge, attitude question asked from them. However, those could affect the participants' behavior in using the mask, which were not examined in this study. We added this subject to text as limitation of the study.

7. which question(s) in the table1 have such meaning or interpretation?

   Response: we asked this subject in question 3 from practice section as follows: “Does the mask use lead to not to consider other protective principles including the social distance?”

8. conclusion is better to be shorter (one paragraph)

   Response: The conclusion was shortened.

9. how general population could distinguish the WHO recommendations?
   Response: The methods of hand washing taught to the public by the media and through the Ministry of Health are similar to those provided by the World Health Organization.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 23 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for improving the manuscript. It is acceptable now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 25 Mar 2021

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