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.96624
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(8); e96624

Peer Review Report for "The Relationship of Respecting Inherent Dignity with Anxiety, Depression, Stress and Quality of Life in Patients with Heart Failure"

Author(s): Kobra Salehi, Farimah Shirani, Vajihe Atashi, Somayeh Ghafari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 25 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 29 Nov 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) — 8 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
1. What do the authors mean by “Pearson statistical test”?
2. Reporting the exact P-value in the text is necessary.
3. Z2 must be equal to 0.84.
4. How about the validity and reliability of the Persian version of MLHFQ?
5. Report all the correlations in the text with the exact P-value and remove Table 3.
Thanks.

Arash Mani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 23 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,

The author should revise these items:

1. In the introduction, they should write about depression and anxiety in patients with heart failure. Please write about risk factors of depression and anxiety in these patients.
2. Please revise the type of study in the method part: This study is a descriptive analytic cross-sectional study.
3. Please explain about it. 30 people were excluded and a sample of 150 people was selected. why did you exclude 30 people?
4. Please explain: how did you do purposive sampling?
5. Please write about New York Heart Association Functional Classification in the method part.
6. Please explain: what is the meaning of 24 or 144 in the dignity questionnaire?
7. Please write about the scoring of quality of life due to MLHFQ.
8. Please write the title of the tables completely.
9. Why did you analyze the correlation between job and marital status with dignity only? What about other variables? (if other variables had no significant correlation with dignity you should write them in the table).
10. The correlation of quality of life and dignity is negative in the table but you write in the text that it has a positive correlation.
11. Please write about the limitation of your study in the discussion part.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Oct 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 (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-in-Chief of Shiraz E-Medical Journal

We would like to submit to the Journal our revised manuscript entitled “The barriers to the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia from the perspective of Iranian critical care nurses: a qualitative descriptive study”.

We gratefully thank you and the reverent reviewers for providing those useful comments. The comments provided us the opportunity for improving the quality of our manuscript. We revised the manuscript based on the reviewers’ comments. The revisions appear in the manuscript in Yellow. Moreover, below we provide responses to reviewer’s concerns and comments.

It is noteworthy that:
• to organize the manuscript, we attempted to strictly adhere to the journal’s author guidelines.
• the manuscript has not previously been published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere.
• all authors approved the content of the manuscript and had significant contributions in the research.

Regards

Responses to reviewers

Reviewer	Reviewers’ comments/questions	Authors’ responses
2	What do you mean by “Pearson statistical test”?	Authors mean Pearson's correlation coefficient and was corrected
2	Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.	This commented was corrected
2	Z2 must be equal to 0.84.	It is mentioned in the text in Materials/Patients and Methods section
2	How about validity and reliability of Persian version of MLHFQ?	Further explanations were provided about the validity and reliability of Persian version of MLHFQ.
2	Report all the correlations in the text with exact P-value and remove Table 3.	we Report all the correlations in the text with exact P-value and remove Table 3.
Associate Editor 1	In introduction, please write about depression and anxiety in patients with heart failure. Please write about risk factors of depression and anxiety in these patients	Further explanations about depression and anxiety were added to the introduction section.
Associate Editor 1	revise type of study in method part: This study is a descriptive analytic cross sectional study	Necessary revisions were made Many thanks

Associate Editor 1	Please explain about it. 30 people were excluded and a sample of 150 people was selected. Why did you exclude 30 people?	Further explanations about depression and anxiety were added to the in Materials/Patients and Methods section
Associate Editor 1	Please explain : how did you do purposive sampling?	Our mean was convenience sampling method that Necessary revisions were done
Associate Editor 1	Please write about New York Heart Association Functional Classification in method part	Further explanations about depression and anxiety were added to the method section. Many thanks
Associate Editor 1	S please explain: what is the meaning of 24 or 144 in dignity questionnaire?	Further explanations were provided in the method section.
Associate Editor 1	Please write about scoring of quality of life due to MLHFQ	Further explanations were provided in the method section.
Associate Editor 1	Please write title of tables completely	Title of tables completed Many thanks.
Associate Editor 1	Why did you analysis the correlation of job and marital status with dignity only? What about other variables?(if other variable had no significant correlation with dignity you should write them in table)	Further explanations and variables added in the table
Associate Editor 1	Correlation of quality of life and dignity is negative in table but you write in text that it has positive correlation	In other words, with an increase in the score of patients' inherent dignity, the quality of life in patients has improved, and their depression, anxiety and stress have decreased
Associate Editor 1	Please write about limitation of your study in discussion part	We write about limitation of our study in the end of discussion part

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.

Arash Mani: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
1. Reporting the exact P-value in the abstract is necessary.
2. Revise Table 3. Report Mean± SD for all the subgroups and remove the T-test column.
3. Using correlation for education and the severity of disease is wrong.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the author for submitting the revised manuscript to SEMJ.
- This manuscript needs an English edition.
- Sentences about Inclusion criteria were interrupted by sentences about classifications of heart failure please revise this paragraph.
- Please revise references 1-8-12 in Endnote format.
- Table 3 needs revision.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document still 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 Editor-in-Chief of Shiraz E-Medical Journal

We would like to submit to the Journal our revised manuscript entitled “The barriers to the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia from the perspective of Iranian critical care nurses: a qualitative descriptive study”.

We gratefully thank you and the reverent reviewers for providing those useful comments. The comments provided us the opportunity for improving the quality of our manuscript. We revised the manuscript based on the reviewers’ comments. The revisions appear in the manuscript in Yellow. Moreover, below we provide responses to reviewer’s concerns and comments.

It is noteworthy that:
• to organize the manuscript, we attempted to strictly adhere to the journal’s author guidelines.
• the manuscript has not previously been published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere.
• all authors approved the content of the manuscript and had significant contributions in the research.

Regards

Responses to reviewers

Reviewer	Reviewers’ comments/questions	Authors’ responses
2	Reporting exact P-value in the abstract is necessary	Report exact P-value in the abstract
2	Revise Table 3. Report Mean± SD for all the subgroups and remove T-test column.	This commented was corrected and Report Mean± SD for smoking and place of living, remove T-test column.
2	Using correlation for education and severity of disease is wrong	Our authors mean spearman correlation and corrected Many thanks
Associate Editor 1	Sentences about Inclusion criteria were interrupted by sentences about classifications of heart failure please revise this paragraph	It was corrected
Associate Editor 1	Please revise references 1-8-12 in Endnote format	Necessary revisions were made

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) 29 Nov 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.