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.90475
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(1); e90475

Peer Review Report for "Developing Urban Family Physician Program in Shiraz, Fars Province, the Doctors' Experiences: A Qualitative Research"

Author(s): Ali Reza Safarpour, Ladan Zarshenas, Azita Jaberi, Mohammad Hadi Imanieh, Manoosh Mehrabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Feb 2019
Revised Date:	19 Aug 2019
Accepted Date:	23 Oct 2019

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

7 May 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for this paper.
Please Correct these items:
1- In the abstract, write a more complete introduction.
2- In the main method, consider the following:
* Write the Method of selecting participants.
* Write the method of determining the volume of participants.
* Write the Research ground.
* Write the main question for the interview and a few examples of sub-question.
* Informed consent and Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality of Patient Information are very necessary.
* Place, time, and duration of interviews.
* What is the data analysis method?
* Inclusion criteria and exclusion from the study.
* How to access participants (family doctors)?
* How the interviews were done?
* What have you recorded during and after the interview?

3- List your study limitations.
4- In the discussion section, you have cited a large amount of content in one reference, Reference No. 7 and 9, please correct.
5- The number of used references is very limited. Please refer to more studies.
6- It is necessary to use up-to-date references.
7- You can use the new reference for the writing method.
8- Check the reference number 4 after writing the year (1898-906). Good luck.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for paying attention to the important topic of the Family Physician Program (FPP). However, the manuscript has some shortages that should be considered, before we can consider it further for the 2nd review :
Reviewer # 1
1. Title :
• Title should be limited to Urban FPP and Shiraz, Fars Province.
2. Abstract:
• Mention the number of participants
• Occupational safety or Job stability? which did you mean?
• Conclusion should be more practical and applicable.
3. Method:
• How many interviewers participated in this study and who were them? In the 4th line, You said, researchers …..?! For an interview with 8 persons, 1 interviewer was enough considering dependability of data.
• Where were the reviews accomplished?
• Ethics code?
4. Results:
• Was there any difference between private vs public doctors' opinions?
• Explain briefly about below subclasses (regardless of supplement):
Step-by-step implementation Consult form instead of referral Receiving franchise Representatives of family physicians for decision-making Health charge card for patients Practitioner's cycling shifts.
• In the abstract; conclusion: you mentioned occupational safety, but it did not mention in any classes of table 2.
• In which part of the result part did you pay attention to the payment system to general physicians in the Urban FPP? (that according to other references is one of the big challenges of physicians)
5. Discussion
• There are many references about urban FPP in both Fars and Mazandaran provinces that is recommended to cite to them.
• Please, revise the discussion and focus only on your direct findings in this study.
• Limitations in your study?
6. References:
Reformat it to EndNote and Journal Style.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
This manuscript needs Major Revision. The author may answer precisely to all reviewers' points.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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 respected reviewers

We are grateful to respond to your meticulous comments by you and the respected editor. Based on these comments and suggestions, we have made careful modifications on the original manuscript, and the correction sections in the revised manuscript are marked with red for reviewer #1 and green for reviewer #2 for easy checking.

Enclosed please find our point-by-point response to the comments raised. As you notice, we agreed with the comments. We would like to take this opportunity to express our wholehearted thanks to you who identified areas of our manuscript that needed corrections or clarifications.

We hope that the revised manuscript is accepted for publication in SEMJ. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Reviewer # 1

1. Title :

• Title should be limited to Urban FPP and Shiraz , Fars Province.

It has been corrected

2. Abstract:

• Mention number of participants

We mentioned in line 117.

• Occupational safety or Job stability ? which did you mean?

We assess this part. it wasn't necessary so we omitted it.

• Conclusion should be more practical and applicable.

We corrected this part line 127

3. Method:

• How many interviewers participated in this study and who were them? In the 4th line You said researchers … ..?! For interview with 8 persons 1 interviewer was enough considering dependability of data.

The amount of participants is added in line 167. But because of the scattering of the interviewees we need 2 interviewers.

• Where were the reviews accomplished?

It is added in line 179

• Ethics code ?

It is added in line 209

4. Results:

• Was there any difference between private vs public doctors opinions?

It is added in line 288

• Explain briefly about below subclasses (regardless of supplement):

Step-by-step implementation Consult form instead of referral Receiving franchise Representatives of family physicians for decision-making Health charge card for patients Practitioner's cycling shifts.

It is added in line 314

• In the abstract ; conclusion: you mentioned occupational safety , but it did not mention in any classes of table 2.

We assess this part. it wasn't necessary so we omitted it.

• In which part of result part did you pay attention to the payment system to general physicians in the Urban FPP? (that according to other references is one of the big challenges of physicians)

It is added in line 288

5. Discussion

• There are many references about urban FPP in both Fars and Mazandaran provinces that is recommended to cite to them.

We add 3 more references.

• Please, revise discussion and focus only on your direct findings in this study.

It has been done thoroughly.

• Limitations in your study?

We add this part in line 407

6. References:

Reformat it to End Note and Journal Style.

It has been done.

Reviewer 2:

1-In the abstract, write a more complete introduction.

It has been corrected. Line 108

2- In the main method, consider the following:

*** Write the Method of selecting participants?**

It has been added in line 170- 183

*** Write the method of determining the volume of participants?**

It has been added in line 170-183

*** Write the Research ground?**

Unfortunately, we couldn't understand this comment

*** Write the main question for the interview and a few examples of sub-question.**

It is added in line 170-183

*** Informed consent and Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality of Patient Information are very necessary.**

We added this parts in line 208

*** Place, time and duration of interviews?**

We added them in line 170-183

***what is data analysis method?**

It is added in line 195

*** Inclusion criteria and exclusion from study?**

It is corrected in line 170-183

*** How to access participants (family doctors)?**

It is added in line 170-183

*** How the interviews were done?**

It is added in line 170-183

*** What have you recorded during and after the interview?**

It is explained in line 170-183

3- List your study limitations?

It has been added in line 407

4- In the discussion section, you have cited a large amount of content in one reference,

Reference No. 7 and 9, please correct.

It is corrected.

5-The number of used references is very limited. Please refer to more studies.

We add 3 more studies.

6-It is necessary to use up-to-date references.

It has been done.

7-You can use the new reference for writing method.

We add one.

8- Check the reference number 4 after writing the year (1898-906).

It has been corrected

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

farnoosh azizi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 22 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
1- In the introduction section, the first sentence is incomplete, the author may write clearly.
2- In qualitative methodology, Research ground, or context, that is corrected, no problem.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Oct 2019

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