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.92726
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(4); e92726

Peer Review Report for "Sleep Hygiene in Medical Students in Tehran; Do They Learn to Attend to Their Own Health?"

Author(s): Omid Pournik, Masoomeh Daneshvar, Shahrzad Pakzadian, Leila Ghalichi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 21 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 3 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) — 15 May 2019

Dear AE,
This is a simple cross sectional questioner based study which was written well but the weakness of this study is single center and limited case number. thus the result of this study can not generalized to all medical students of other university. especially the frequency of sleep problem was higher in our capital and some degree of the high burden of sleep problem might be attributable to living and studying in a crowded city with traffic problem. this explanation need to be notified in discussion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 19 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
- The article is a single study and can not be generalized to all students.
- There is great need for editing from title to abstract and many sentences in text.
- The statistics should be presented as HR with CI for sleep disturbance.
- Discussion needs to be more relevant and updated.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 19 Oct 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 editor

We appreciate the time and effort of the respectful reviewers and editors regarding their comments on our manuscript submitted to your valuable journal. We totally agree with both reviewers on the limitation of our study, which was due to its cross section nature. We had already highlighted it in the limitation section of the manuscript, and also made the following changes to emphasis even more:

- In The title, we added the location of the study.
- In the abstract we emphasized on the study type and location.
- We added more details to the limitation section of the study, highlighting both the effects of the characteristics of Tehran as a metropolis on sleep disorders and the single center cross sectional nature of the study.
- In the conclusion, we indicated lack of generalizability of the findings.
- We also updated the discussion section for more recent and relevant content.

Also, regarding the necessity of 95% CI, we added 95% CI to all important endpoints of interest. All changes have been highlighted in the submitted manuscript.

Once again, we appreciate the reviewers and editors and we are looking forward to hearing from your journal.

Best Regards

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)** 3 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.