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.91888
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(4); e91888

Peer Review Report for "Thyroid Function and Depressive Symptoms in Older Adults: A Five-Year Follow-Up"

Author(s): Mahboube Khoozan, Sussan Moudi, Farzan Kheirkhah, Seyed Reza Hosseini, Ali Bijani, Romina Hamzehpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 5 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 17 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) — 20 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Talk about the time of the study, inclusion/exclusion criteria, sampling method, instruments, and statistical methods in the abstract.
2. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.
3. 840 individuals had no depressive symptoms and 112 of them were hypothyroid. Therefore you must follow up 728 individuals. Why 571?
4. There was no information about variable selection technique in regression modeling.
Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,
- The abstract: background and method sections are too short and non-informative.
- In article: method, paragraph 5 lines 4-5 the criteria of diagnosing hyper and hypothyroidism is incorrect. In hypothyroidism, TSH is increased and in hyperthyroidism, it is decreased. In addition, the cutoff value of TSH for diagnosis of hyperthyroidism is usually

<0.1 especially in the elderly. In old age, there is a physiologic decrease in TSH level. Also, the cutoff values are also dependent on laboratory kits. What were the normal levels of TSH in the laboratory?
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Nov 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.

Dear Dr. Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Editor-in-Chief

Shiraz E-Medical Journal

Hello!

Thanks for your email about our manuscript entitled "Thyroid function and depressive symptoms in older adults: 5- year follow-up" with article ID: 91888.

All of dear reviewers´ comments have been considered in the revised manuscript.

They are summarized in the table below. Changes have been highlighted in yellow in the revised article.

Reviewers´ comments	**Answers**
Talk about time of the study, inclusion/exclusion criteria, sampling method, instruments and statistical methods in the abstract.	All of these recommendations have been provided in the revised "Methods" of the abstract.
Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.	Exact p-value measure has been provided in abstract and main text.
840 individuals had no depressive symptoms and 112 of them were hypothyroid. Therefore you must follow up 728 individuals. Why 571?	Thanks. It has been described in the revised article.
There was no information about variable selection technique in regression modeling.	It has been described in the revised "Methods"; furthermore, table 2 has been changed and all of covariates used in regression modeling have been presented in table 2.
In abstract: background and method sections are too short and non informative.	Abstract has been improved according to the comments of the two dear reviewers.
In article: method, paragraph 5 lines 4-5 the criteria of diagnosing hyper and hypo thyroidism is incorrect. In hypo thyroidism TSH is increased and in hyperthyroidism it is decreased.In addition the cutoff value of TSH for diagnosis of hyper thyroidism is usually <0.1 specially in the elderly .In old age there	Thanks. It has been corrected. In addition to, we think presenting of subclinical hypo and hyper thyroidism in Results can answer to reviewer´s question.

is a physiologic decrease in TSH level. Also the cutoff values are also dependent on laboratory kits.What were the normal levels of TSH in the laboratory?	

With Best Wishes

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) — 25 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Reporting the exact P-value in the text is necessary. P>0.05 is not true.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 27 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The revision is in accordance with reviewers' comments and the manuscript can be published after minor revision as suggested by reviewers.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 29 Dec 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.

Dear Dr. Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Editor-in-Chief

Shiraz E-Medical Journal

Hello!

Thanks for your email to recommend us some changes to improve our manuscript entitled as "Thyroid function and depressive symptoms in older adults: 5- year follow-up" with article ID: 91888.

Dear reviewer asked us to report exact P-value in the text. He emphasized that "P>0.05 is not true". With respect to his comment, the exact p-value has been reported in the revised manuscript. These changes have been highlighted in yellow.

With Best Regards

Sussan Moudi

Associate Professor of Psychiatry

Corresponding Author

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 17 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.