Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 24 · Issue 1 · e130052

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Shift Work as a Risk Factor for Poor Sleep Quality and Daytime Sleepiness in Khorasan Railway Personnel in Iran

Lahya Afshari Saleh, Feisal Rahimpour, Ehsan Rafeemanesh, Fatemeh Ahmadi, Vida Vakili, Faezeh Yazdani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 Jul 2022	23 Nov 2022	4 Dec 2022	10.5812/semj-130052

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 Editor-in-Chief 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

1 comment · 4 Sep 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 4 Sep 2022

Major Revision

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.

In the name of GOD

Greetings and Best Regards

To Dear Associate Editor 1:

Q1: The abriviations in the abstract must be described.

R1: Corrections have been made

Q2: In the introduction, more relevant and more up-to-date studies should be used
R2: Corrections have been made

Q3: Demographic information is questionnaire or checklist?
R3: Checklist; Necessary corrections have been made

Q4: Please describe the physical examinations

R4: We tried to use better words, so we removed the word "physical examinations" and described it like this: The data collection method was through checklist containing demographic information and related factors such as employment history and through a physician to evaluate underlying diseases, body mass index (BMI), smoking and use of substances (past medical history) and finally, completion of standard questionnaires, including Pittsburgh sleep quality index (PSQI), Karolinska sleepiness scale (KSS) and STOP-BANG questionnaire (STOP-BANG).

Q5: This phrase “work shift “ was used in wrong.

R5: This word was replaced by "shift work" in the text

Q6: When and in which shifts the participants were complited the questionnaires?

R6: Corrections have been made; The evaluation of all participants was regularly planned and carried out on Fridays [Friday is an official weekly holiday in Iran] in March and April 2021 at 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM.

Q7: The method is ambiguous and needs further explanation

R7: Corrections have been made; In general, the method section was rewritten

Q8: The titles of the tables are not complete and descriptive.

R8: Titles and explanations of all tables were rewritten

Q9: In my opinion, the results and tables do not provide any new knowledge
Provide a model with the opinion of a statistician

R9: Thanks for your great comment; Yes, we made the necessary corrections and used binary logistic regression as a model to identify the effect of the shift work (as a risk factor) on the variables of sleep quality and daytime sleepiness.

Q10: The discussion could be improved with better comparisons

R10: Corrections have been made

Thank you

Greetings and Best Regards

To Dear Associate Editor 2:
Q1. Please give more information about the questionnaires, number of questions and scoring.

R1: Thanks for your great comment; Corrections have been made

Q2. Report quantitative findings in the abstract using mean± SD or number (%) and also report exact P-values.

R2: Corrections have been made

Q3. Please report CVI and CVR for the Persian version of each tool.
R3: Corrections have been made

Q4. Report quantitative findings as mean± SD.
R4: Corrections have been made

Q5. T-test is not about relationship.
R4: Yes, this typographical error was corrected in the entire article

Q6. Please report exact P-values. P<0.05 or P>0.05 is not true.
R6: Corrections have been made

Q7. Merge the first two tables.

R7: Corrections have been made

Q8. What do you mean by “number (%) of cut points”?
R8: Yes, we tried to use the right words in this case; Below the same table, we added this explanation and used "high score" instead of "cut point": ***** The number (percentage) of participants who had scores above the cut-off points of each scale; High scores: PSQI score ≥ 5, KSS score ≥ 7, STOP-BANG score ≥ 4.

Q9. Comparison of PSQI and KSS scores doesn’t make sense. The range of total scores are very different.

Q9: Thanks for your great comment; we removed that table and used a binary regression model instead

Thank you

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

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.

In the name of GOD

Greetings and Best Regards

To Dear Reviewer 1:

Q1: Please report CVI and CVR for the Persian version of each tool

R1: Corrections have been made

Q2: In Table, please report P-values for all the variables
R2: Corrections have been made

Q3: In Table 4, remove “wald” and “df” columns
R3: Corrections have been made

Thank you

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.