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.91348
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(2); e91348

Peer Review Report for "Challenges for Detection of Elderly Abuse in Teaching Hospitals: A Interventional Study to Improve the Knowledge of Health Care Providers"

Author(s): Akram Fallah Shojaei Mardomakdehi, Shima Sum, Mahbobeh Faramarzi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	7 Mar 2019
Revised Date:	13 Jun 2019
Accepted Date:	30 Jun 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) — 10 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
NOT innovation. educational intervention is not good.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 26 Apr 2019

Dear EIC,
The article needs revision.
- Editing is needed.
- The limitations of the study and the need for a complete cycle of care not only the detection of abuse need to be mentioned.
- The discussion needs to be relevant to the findings of this study.
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.

Ref.: Ms. No. 91348
Challenges of screening of elderly abuse in teaching hospitals: A plan to intervention

Dear Editor-in-Chief
Shiraz E-Medical Journal

Thank you for Reviewers' valuable comments to revise the Manuscript. 91348. I revised the paper according to the comments of the referee(s) and are included the response at the bottom of this letter.
Also, I highlighted the changes with yellow color in the text.

1. I changed the title to: Challenges for detection of elderly abuse in teaching hospitals: A interventional study to improve the knowledge of health care providers
2. The introduction was improved.
3. The discussion was related with results of the study.
4. The suggestion of Associate Editor was added in the limitation section.
5. A native English Editor, Dr. Dr. Evangeline Foronda, edited the paper.

Once again, thank you for helping me to improve the manuscript. I am looking forward to receiving your good news for publication of the paper.

Sincerely,

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 30 Jun 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.