Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 25 · Issue 2 · e141332

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Healthy Aging from the Perspective of Older Adults: A Descriptive Qualitative Study

Tayebeh Saki, Fatemeh Rashidi, Mehdi Mamene, Hamed Azadi, Arman Azadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 Sep 2023	30 Dec 2023	6 Jan 2024	10.5812/semj-141332

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 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

1 comment · 18 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 18 Nov 2023

Dear Editor
This study can be accepted; however, some ambiguity should be cleared up.
- Time of the Study?
- It's better to present a table of participants and coding.
- The mean age of the samples was 68.2 years, with a range of 62 to 75 years. A person aged 62 years is not defined as elderly. How were these participants included?
- The first paragraph of the findings is written quantitatively.
- Please explain the context of the study and the rationale for it.
- The first paragraph of the discussion generalizes the findings to all of Iran, and this is wrong.
- Professional editing is needed.

Thanks a lot
Thanks a Lot

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.

Author response to reviewers' Comment

No.	Editors' / reviewers' comment	Response to comment	Page-Lines
Reviewer #1	When did this study is implemented?	Thank you for your valuable comments. Amended	3,27
Reviewer #1	Its better to present a table of participants' characteristics and coding	Amended. The hypothesis was stated at the last paragraph of background	tables
Reviewer #1	- The first paragraph of finding is written quantitatively and should be improve in line with the study method,	amended	4,4
Reviewer #1	- Plz explain about context of the study and why did you select your participants from two province? Were the context retirees' center? If so, your sampling method will be convenience rather than purposeful.	Revised. The study context was selected in west and south-west of Iran, the cities where the first author lived in both.	3,30

Reviewer #1	- In the first paragraph of discussion the authors generalized their findings on total of older Iranian which is wrong approach.	Revised	9,4
Reviewer #1	- professional editing is needed.	Revised	
Reviewer #2	Keywords are redundant and wrong. You have to mention them based on Mesh term.	Revised	1,20
Reviewer #2	Introduction: Please explain the novelty of this study	By employing qualitative methods to explore the perspective of older adults on healthy aging, researchers can generate deeper understanding of the complexities and subjective experiences of aging, contributing to development of more population and person-centered approaches to promoting health and well-	3,14-20

		being in older adults.	
Reviewer #2	Method: What is your definition for data saturation and how you did approach to this issue during your interview and data analysis.	Following 12 interviews, we noticed a lack of new themes emerging, and following 3 further interviews, we considered that we had reached saturation for the aims of this study.	4,14-16
Reviewer #2	Method: please clarify more that how did you assure of the study rigor? how did you get the feedback of the elderly participants as you claimed "derived codes and categories to the participants to validate the accuracy and seek their perspectives"? Were they familiar to categories and codes you derived?	The codes and categories explained verbally to participants.	4,21-22

Reviewer #2	It needs more deep discussion about how and through which infrastructure and /or based on what national or international-based interventions or experiences the expectations of the older adults would be met?	amended	9,10-16
Reviewer #2	Conclusion: Based on the revised discussion the conclusion should be revised as we	revised	12, 2-5

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 16 Dec 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 16 Dec 2023

Dear authors, the new version is much better than the previous one. However, the following shortcomings noted by the referees should be addressed by the authors for the manuscript to be suitable for publication.
Reviewer 1: Please correct the participants table. Table 1 is more like a table used in quantitative studies. Therefore, it should be corrected.
Reviewer 2: Is the following sentence in the conclusion based on your findings? A robust healthcare system with adequate resources and infrastructure is essential. This includes hospitals, clinics, long-term care facilities, and primary healthcare centers. Access to healthcare services, including preventive care, regular check-ups, and specialized geriatric care, is crucial for promoting healthy aging. I cannot connect these recommendations with your results or discussion. Also, the sentence "The elderly participating in this study stated that despite 6 difficulties and socioeconomic issues, they strive to maintain and improve their health" is a results- or discussion-oriented sentence rather than a conclusion. In the conclusion, you should mention a very brief and general finding of your study and its related recommendations.
English editing is needed.

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.

Author response to reviewers' Comment

No.	Editors' / reviewers' comment	Response to comment	Page-Lines
Reviewer #1	Please correct participants table. Table 1 is more like to quantitative studies.	Table 1 was removed and its information was given in the form of a sentence in the text	5, 3-8
Reviewer #2	In the conclusion you should mention a very brief and general finding of your study and its related recommendations.	As mentioned by reviewer the conclusion revised and those sentences that were unclear and were not derived from the findings deleted.	11, 29-31
	English editing	the article was written and edited by second author how is expert in English and has a good score in IELTS	

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 1 Jan 2024 – 1 Jan 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 1 Jan 2024

Dear editor

The manuscript can be published.

Thanks a lot

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 1 Jan 2024

Considering the changes made based on the referees' comments, the manuscript is suitable for publication.