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.91367
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(7); e91367

Peer Review Report for "Assessing the Delays in Patients Undergoing Orthopedic Surgery and the Associated Factors at Taleghani Hospital"

Author(s): Reza Zandi, Adel Ebrahimpour, Mohammad Ali Okhovatpour, Amirjafar Adibi, Mohammad Reza Minator Sajadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 27 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 30 Apr 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) — 11 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Report your main findings quantitatively in the abstract (median and IQR).
2. Check and revise your keywords.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
This study aimed to investigate the delay in several steps in a single center, single field (orthopedics), and on a small available sample with a descriptive manner.
However this investigation has several good massages but have vital methodological concerns. Before considering your manuscript for further evaluation please revise it according to following comments. Especially note to the final comment regarding the change of the study format so that we can review it again:
1- There is no standard for comparison of time of delay, for example, how do you know that

(T8) and (T9), with a mean ±SD of 11.85±5.20 and 13.37±4.95 minutes, respectively is high??? Is there any universal standard? Perhaps it is fantastically small delay.
2- How did you investigate and identified the factors affect on delay? They are not reported.
3- What does it mean by: “Eleven different persons transferred the patients to the OR, 5 patients by one personnel, 4 by another, 3 by another, and 2 by another, while the other 7 patients were transferred by a different personnel.” “Eleven surgeons performed the procedures; of 46 procedures, 16 were performed by one surgeon, 8 by another, and 7 by another, while 8 surgeons only performed one or two of the procedures.” Are these important findings? Is it possible to have a table for this findings?
4- Tables are duplicated in result and Results are duplicated in discussion.
5- Discussion in quite prolix, conclusion is quite long and boring,
***** SO it is strongly recommended to change the format of the present study to a brief report or letter to the editor.
Best.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
Before considering this manuscript for further evaluation please the authors revise it according to following comments of two independent reviewers. Especially note to the comment regarding the change of the study format.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Jul 2019

Dear Authors,
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

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 editor,

Thanks for the revision.

We have changed the manuscript to brief report according to the journal's instructions and the response to reviewers are as follows:

Response to reviewer #1:

Before considering your manuscript for further evaluation please revise it according to following comments. Especially note to the final comment regarding the change of the study format so that we can review it again. Reply: The manuscript changed to brief report.

1- There is no standard for comparison of time of delay, for example how do you know that (T8) and (T9), with a mean ±SD of 11.85±5.20 and 13.37±4.95 minutes, respectively is high??? Is there any universal standard? Perhaps it is fantastically small delay. Reply: There were no studies reporting these intervals and we have investigated them for the first time. "Lack of similar studies for comparison" has been added in the discussion section.

2- How did you investigate and identified the factors affect on delay? They are not reported. Reply: The association of several variables, such as patients' sex, type and person in charge of transfer, etc. with the delays have been evaluated and reported in results and discussion.

3- What does in meant by: "Eleven different persons transferred the patients to the OR, 5 patients by one personnel, 4 by another, 3 by another and 2 by another, while the other 7 patients were transferred by a different personnel." "Eleven surgeons performed the procedures; of 46 procedures, 16 were performed by one surgeon, 8 by another, and 7 by another, while 8 surgeons only performed one or two of the procedures." Are these important findings? Is it possible to have a table for this findings? Reply: The results and discussion sections have been rewritten and unclear sentences have been rephrased.

4- Tables are duplicated in result and Results are duplicated in discussion. Reply: The results section has been rewritten and mixed with discussion, according to the journal's instructions and the duplicated results have been omitted.

5- Discussion in quite prolix, conclusion is quite long and boring, Reply: The discussion section has been rewritten.

***** SO it is strongly recommended to change the format of present study to brief report or letter to the editor. Reply: The manuscript was changed to brief report.

Response to reviewer 2:

1. Report your main findings quantitatively in the abstract (median and IQR). Reply: The abstract was changed to 200 words to fit the journal's instructions on brief report.

2. Check and revise your keywords. Reply: Keywords are selected from Mesh database and the closest keywords to our study have been selected. Do you have any other suggestions?

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 2 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the changes the authors have made in the article format. They should revise the manuscript according to the attached comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 Feb 2020

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.

1.Is this correct? I think bed is more suited for.

“Table” changed to bed. (Abstract)

2. What type of GAP. Please be more specific on tis.

Corrected: (delays in informing the ward and the time to transfer the patient to the ward) (conclusion/ abstract)

3. Please omit Appointments and Schedules and add delay , Trhran

Deleted and Corrected. (Keywords)

4. Omit this word.

Deleted. (first line in method)

5. Verbal or written informed?

Corrected (written informed). (in method)

6. Please revise this part to a more clear one.

“And the nine time periods as T1 to T9 which are described as: ….”

Corrected: (transferring the patient to OR and reverse)

7. Please insert one or two decimals all over the text for all numbers you have stated. In some cases you have one decimal (69.6) and other cases two decimals (18.99). It should be uniform.

Corrected. All numbers changed to one decimal. (first line in result and discussion)

8. Is this an important finding? Could you omit this sentence?

“Patients were transferred by 11 different personnel and T2 was significantly different by the person in charge of transfer, ranging from 10-45 minutes “

Yes, deleted. (first paragraph in result and discussion)

9. What does this mean?

Corrected: we suggest that one personnel for patients’

10. Please be more specific on this. Elevator and hospital system???

Corrected. (To coordinate with the operating room to provide defects in this path).

11. Hospital design and environment is important for time delays and wastage of time (if we want to be more specific we can call delay, time wastage). So you can use following reference for emphasizing this issue and for more details if you want. What do hospital doctors and nurses think wastes their time?

Kamran Bagheri Lankarani, Sulmaz Ghahramani, Marjan Roozitalab, Mohammadreza Zakeri, Behnam Honarvar, Hengameh Kasraei

Corrected.

12. It is a statistical term. Was these delays significantly more than other?

Corrected. Deleted significant delays.

13.? or bed?

“Table” changed to bed. (second paragraph in result and discussion)

14. Please describe more about this. (last sentence in second paragraph in result and discussion)

Corrected. BMI’age’

15. You did not study these issues so you cannot state this part. The conclusion should only be according the study findings.

to improve the OR efficiency, patient flow, And so we can predict that causes increase patients’ satisfaction, and reduce the staff’s work load. (last sentence in last paragraph in result and discussion)

16. Please prepare two tables. Or for better format of table consult with a statistician.

Corrected. consulted with a statistician

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Most revisions are correct. please the authors correct 4 extra comments (all related to newly added parts).
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 22 Apr 2020

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 (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.

1-Is this correct?

“and or training the personnel can reduce this delay”

Correct: Their awareness of time wastage and their greater coordination to reduce time loss

2- I mentioned this before. Please choose another term for this issue. For example hospital authorities or other term you think better.

“The hospital system also plays a pivotal role in these durations

Correct: The hospital authorities also plays a pivotal role in these durations

3- You can use general term of “time wastage”. ?

“. In our hospital, there is no elevator for patients’ transfer to the OR, which can prolong the delays.”

Correct: .(In our hospital, there is no elevator for patients’ transfer to the OR, which can time wastage).

4- I suggest this paragraph if you are agree:

to regulate coordination between OR and ward and also to resolve the environmental barriers to decrease this delay (in this case, design an elevator to decrease delay of patient transfer between OR and ward.)

“To coordinate with the operating room to provide defects in this path)

correct:

(to regulate coordination between OR and ward and also to resolve the environmental barriers to decrease this delay, design an elevator to decrease delay

5-what do you mean?

“(BMI’age)’

Correct:

.(increase BMI and age can cause time wastage.

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.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 30 Apr 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.