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.90509
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(5); e90509

Peer Review Report for "Knowledge Translation at Lorestan University of Medical Sciences: Evidence from Iran"

Author(s): Mohammad Hasan Imani-Nasab, Soraya Nouraei Motlagh, Peivand Bastani, Mehdi Birjandi, Katayoon Bakhtiar, Mahnaz Samadbeik

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 18 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 16 Jan 2020

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)

21 Apr 2019

Dear AE
Thanks to the authors for paying attention to KT as an important issue in the research system . There are several points that should be regarded in the next revision, although it could not be assumed as a guarantee to accept thia manuscript or its format of publication:
Title :
• Restrict it to the lorestan university of medical sciences.
Abstract:
• Name the checklist that was used “Satori”
• Mention max score , for example 2.13 of total score …….
• Revise abstract according to what will be stated in the next paragraphs.
• Conclusion should only be related directly to your findings in this study.
Introduction:
• Introduction is long, shorten it.
Method:
• State lorestan statistical community number .
• Sample size calculation is not reasonable, considering both s=0.5 and d=0.11 (according to which evidences did you consider s=0.5 and in the presence of s=0.5, d=0.11 is not

logical)

• Sampling method was not clarified enough .

• 7th line : Tool

• Why didn't use multivariable analysis ? Use and report it.

• Ethical code?

Results:

• Show demographic and university related characteristics of participants in a separate table .

• Show maximum achievable score of each item in the related row of both tables 1 and 2.

• Mention the multivariable analysis results .

• In the table 2: row 3 : 2.2 instead of 2/2

Discussion:

• Explain Limitations of your study.

• Cite to more domestic references.

• Reduce the size of Conclusion

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Apr 2019

Dear EIC,

According to reviewers' comments, major revision is needed.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 Apr 2019

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.

Responses to the comments of Reviewers

We thank anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive comments and suggestions. We considered the comments of the reviewer in revising our manuscript so as to make our paper worthy of publication in the SEMJ .

Responses to the comments of Reviewer#1

Dear Authors
*Thank you for paying attention to KT as an important issue in the research system . There are several points that should be regarded in the next revision***.**
Thank you very much for valuable comments. We revised the manuscript as suggested and responded to each comment.

Title :
• Restrict it to the lorestan university of medical sciences.
Title was restricted to the lorestan university of medical sciences.

Abstract:
- *Name the checklist that was used "Satori"*

The checklist name was added [See page 1 of the revised manuscript].

- *Mention max score , for example 2.13 of total score …..…*

Max score was mentioned [See page 1 of the revised manuscript].

- *Revise abstract according to what will be stated in the next paragraphs*

The abstract was revised according to what will be stated in the next paragraphs.

- *Conclusion should only be related directly to your findings in this study*

Its revised based on the comment [See page 1 of the revised manuscript].

Introduction:
• Introduction is long, shorten it.
Introduction was shortened in the revised manuscript as recommended. [See pages 2 and 3 of the revised manuscript.]

Method:

• State lorestan statistical community number .

lorestan statistical community number was stated.

• Sample size calculation is not reasonable, considering both s=0.5 and d=0.11 (according to which evidences did you consider s=0.5 and in the presence of s=0.5, d=0.11 is not logical)

The project's statical consultant did not understand the question. Is there a match between d and S to determine the sample size? As we know, the value of d is the degree of precision that the researchers determine according to the conditions, and the value of s is also determined by the pilot study. If being big of standard deviation is questioned, this will show its impact on the larger sample size.

• Sampling method was not clarified enough .

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Thank you for your attempts to improve your manuscript. Some questions have been remained, even though this report may be accepted finally as a brief communication for publication.
1. In which year this study was conducted?
2. please merge tables 1 and 2 as one table and Tables 3 and 4 as another table.
3. Which (and why) multivariable analysis did you use? Name it in the method.
4. How checklists were distributed among interviewees? (by email, by post, ...?)
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' points, still needs to revise this article. The authors mentioned this study was conducted in 2017, why they did not apply to get ethic's code?
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jun 2019

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

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Responses to the comments of Reviewers

We thank anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive comments and suggestions. We considered the comments of the reviewer in revising our manuscript so as to make our paper worthy of publication in the SEMJ .

Responses to the comments of Reviewer#1

Dear Author(s)

Thank you for your attempts to improve your manuscript. Some questions have been remained, eventhough this report may be accepted finally as a brief communication

for publication.

The brief communication is not enough to present the important outputs of our study. Therefore, please, accept our manuscript as a fulltext original paper.

1. *In which year this study was conducted?*

The year of study was added to the methods section of abstract and fulltext. [See page 1 of the revised manuscript].

2. please merge tables 1 and 2 as a one table and Tables 3 and 4 as another table.

The tables were merged as possible. . [Please see Tables 2 and 3 of the revised manuscript].

3. Which (and why) multivariable analysis did you use? Name it in method.

Because of possible correlation between KT dimensions, the Multivariate ANalysis Of VAriance (MANOVA) was used to test the relationship between indipended valiables (demographic and academic characteristics) and the denpended variables (the mean scores of KT dimintions). .[See page 4 of the revised manuscript].

4. How checklists were distributed among interviewees? (by email, by post, ...?)

Data were collected by in-person distribution of questionnaires. [See page 3 of the revised manuscript].

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author
According to the reviewers points , still needs to revise your article. You mentioned this study was conducted in 2017, why you did not apply to get ethic's code?

The ethical code for cross-sectional study was not necessary in our university when the project was approved by the Research and Technology Deputy of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, and it was only necessary for interventional study.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 10 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
This article could be accepted as Brief Report.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 30 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Kamran Bagheri Lankarani: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 4 Oct 2019

Dear Authors,
The article should be revised to the format of a brief report according to the journal's standards.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Responses to the comment of Reviewer

Dear Editor of SEMJ

Responses to the comments of Reviewer#1

Reviewer 1:
Accepted as Reviewer 1:
Accepted as Brief Report
Thank you very much for acceptance of our manuscript. We revised the manuscript as Brief Report.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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** (3) — 11 Jan 2020

Dear AE<
This Brief report is accepted for publication.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) — 11 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) — 16 Jan 2020

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