Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 22 · Issue 12 · e113890

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Community Knowledge and Behavior About COVID-19 and Their Attitude Toward Public Policies Implemented Against This Pandemic in the Northwest of Iran

Sedigheh Salavati, Hamid Shokri, Asghar Tanomand, Maryam Shirvani-Shiri, Ali Soleimani, Roghayyeh Rostami

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Feb 2021	11 May 2021	5 Jun 2021	10.5812/semj.113890

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Mar 2021 – 15 Apr 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Mar 2021

Dear Authors
Please edit your article for language and respond to all points mentioned in the attached PDF.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 15 Apr 2021

Dear Authors
Your manuscript needs major revision, especially in the methods section. It is recommended that you revise the format to a brief report.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their precious time and invaluable comments. We have carefully addressed all the comments. The corresponding changes and refinements made in the revised paper are summarized in our response below

Reviewer 1	***Reply***
1. Include time and location of the study in the abstract.	Abstract has now been amended
2. Remove simultaneous. Multiple regression is true.	it has now been amended
3.There was no information about the tools in the abstract	Abstract has now been amended
4. Report 34/8±3/9 as 34.8± 3.9	it has now been amended
5. Estimate sample size based on the main aim of the study. Morgan table is not appropriate for the current study	it has now been amended
6. Mean score of 8 shows a high level of knowledge or total score of 9?	The second sections of questionnaire was about respondent's knowledge of COVID-19 which included of 9 items and every one answered to at least 8 items meant that he/she had high level of knowledge
7. Give more information about content (CVI, CVR) and face validity.	it has now been amended
8. Cronbach's alpha is not appropriate for yes/no questions.	it has now been amended
9. Reported sample size in the abstract and methods is 383 but in the results is 584!	it has now been amended
10.Replace P<0.001 instead of P<0.0001	it has now been amended
11. In Table 2, use "." to show decimals.	it has now been amended
12. In Table 4, baseline categories are not clear for qualitative variables.	it has now been amended

Answer to comment of Reviewer 1 in the manuscript are highlighted by yellow color.

Reviewer 2:

***In the results section of abstract, using garlic and herbal drinks were in the same group**.

***Method of sampling is vague, please explain each of the below item in detail:**

1: How did you know that which mobile numbers were belonged to each of income zone?

Answer: According to the database of the post office, there are 31 postcode districts in the city, and the geographical address of each area is also specified. Therefore, the suburban areas can be separated from other areas of the city.

2: How did you consider each mobile number to each person; some persons may had more than one mobile number?

Answer: The questionnaire was designed in a way that it is not possible to answer it twice with one device. On the other hand, the person who answered the questionnaire once will not be logically willing to complete the questionnaire for the second time. In the case of the likelihood of sending a questionnaire to two phone numbers of one person, it can be said that it is one of the limitations of this research, so this point was added to the limitations section.

3: Did you apply proportional-based sampling for selection postal code districts?

Answer: Based on the approximate specificity of the population in each of the postcode districts, 15 randomly selected areas included almost 50% of the total population of the urban area.

4: How about sampling from middle-class groups (the majority group of the community)?

Answer: In fact, sampling has been conducted on the marginalized areas and other districts of the city, so the study sample includes the group of people with middle-income. And the frequency distribution related to the household income question shows that the distribution of the questionnaire in all economic groups is appropriate.

5: Why did you chose 15 out of 31 districts?

Answer: First, 15 districts were randomly selected, and then it was examined that these 15 districts include approximately 50% of the total urban area population. And this 50% included the population of marginalized areas and other areas; this point was also added to the methodology section.

6: Why did you send the message for 10% of population in the selected areas?

Answer: Since this study is online and there is a low probability of answering the questionnaire, the link of the questionnaire was sent to a larger number of people so that the response rate to the questionnaire would be at the desired level. Besides, by sending the questionnaire to a fixed percentage of the population in each district, the basis proportion mentioned by the esteemed referee in paragraph 3 has been considered.

7: How did you check if responders by the expected percentage in each zone filled the questionnaire?

Answer: This case could not have been checked. Therefore it was mentioned as one of the limitations in the article.

8: Did access to mobile numbers in Governor's office was ethically approved?

Answer: Yes, since the governorate is the highest executive and political authority in the city, it was facilitated to obtain the necessary permissions from the relevant departments to use telephone numbers.

9: If all residents of Maragheh have mobile or registered mobile numbers?

Answer: No, not all the population of the city (or the population over 16 years old according to the inclusion criteria) have access to a mobile phone but due to the need to conduct the online study during the conditions of Coronavirus, there is no better way to collect data. So this point was added to the limitations section.

How (by which reference) did you score and classify the questionnaire?

Answer: About the comment of the honorable referee on the scoring criteria of the questionnaire, it should be mentioned that since it's a researcher-made questionnaire, scoring the various dimensions of the questionnaire was conducted based on the decision of the research team. Also, the opinion of experts involved in determining the validity of the questionnaire was considered in this regard.

Please mention the alpha of each component (knowledge, attitude and behavior) separately?

Answer: The reliability of questions with Likert scale such as attitude about policies (0.82) and behaviour (0.71) was estimated through Cronbach’s alpha and were reported separately and about yes/no questions like as knowledge was estimated 0.70 through Kuder-Richardson.

*About the comment of the honorable referee on the second limitation, it should be mentioned that we cited a reliable source to write this limitation.

*Other comments also was done in the manuscript and are highlighted by green color.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 4 Jun 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 4 Jun 2021

Dear Authors

Thank you for improving the manuscript.