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.97127
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(8); e97127

Peer Review Report for "Out of Pocket Payment by Inpatients After Health Sector Evolution Plan and Its Effecting Factors: A Report of Iran"

Author(s): Hesam Seyedin, Mahnaz Afshari, Parvaneh Isfahani, Kobra Sharifkazemi, Malihe Morshedi, Amin Akbari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 16 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 21 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Mohammadreza Zakeri: Reviewer | Revision (0) 22 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Background and Objectives need revision. (for example, health system goals are improvement of the living conditions?)
Material and Methods need revision. (why Authors did not use administrative data?)
- please explain why you did not use hospital data 1in 1392 for comparison?
- please explain why you used the private hospital?
- please correct software version, 18 or 19?
Results:
- why the Rasoul hospital had 71.1 percentage of OOP?
- please correct the Number of patients for hospital type in Table 4
Discussion:
- please correct the percentage of OOP for hospital services by National Health Accounts in 1392
- please delete the World Bank report about OOP!
- please review discussion about CHE, it is not applicable here!!!
Conclusion:

- rewrite it, please.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
before considering this manuscript for further evaluation the authors have to revise the manuscript totally. especially English editing and addition of a control group as a comparison before the HSEP.
Comments are attached as comments in the word file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have to revise the manuscript before further evaluation. especially results and discussion should be changed totally. There is a critical concern about the validity of findings since first: the private hospital was included in the study. and second, they had no sample for comparison before HSEP.
- Discussion is not in line with the findings.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 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.

Reviewer	Reviewer comment(s)	Response
Reviewer 1:	*Before considering your manuscript for further evaluation you have to revise the manuscript totally. Especially English editing and add of a control group as comparison before the HSEP.*	**The authors revise the manuscript totally.**
	Comments are attached as comment in word file.	**We answered all comment in the manuscript.**
Reviewer 2:	*Background and Objectives need revision. (For example, health system goals are improvement of the living conditions?)*	**Background was completely corrected.**
	Material and Methods need revision. (Why Authors did not use administrative data?)	**Due to restrictions on information resources**
	- please explain why you did not use hospital data 1in 1392 for comparison?	**This study has been designed and implemented after HTP**
	- please explain why you used the private hospital?	**4 hospitals affiliated with Iran University of Medical Sciences were randomly selected**
	- please correct software version, 18 or 19?	**It was corrected**
	Results: *- why the Rasoul hospital had 71.1 percentage of OOP?*	**samples were selected based on proportional allocation and convenience sampling**
	- please correct the Number of patients for hospital type in Table 4	**It was corrected**
	Discussion: *- please correct the percentage of OOP for hospital services by National Health Accounts in 1392*	**It was corrected**
	Please delete the World Bank report about OOP!	**It was corrected**
	please review discussion about CHE, it is not applicable here!!!	**Discussion was completely corrected**
	Conclusion: rewrite it, please	**Conclusion changed based on results**
Associate Editor's Comments:	*you have to revise the manuscript before further evaluation. Especially results and there is a critical concern about the validity of findings since first: the private hospital was included in the study.*	**The results was corrected based on collected data.**
	second you had no sample for comparison before HSEP.	**Due to restrictions on information resources, we had to design and implement this study after HTP**
	discussion should be changed totally. discussion is not in line with the findings .	**Discussion was completely corrected**

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.

Mohammadreza Zakeri: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Jan 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for revising the manuscript.
There are still many concerns about the study. especially in the discussion part.
- Please note to the AE as reviewer's comment in the attached file. one important concern is the main finding which is not correctly concluded. please revise this issue in the whole manuscript.
- THE MAIN CONCLUSION IS NOT CORRECT. PLEASE REVISE IT IN the WHOLE MANUSCRIPT. THE GOAL OF HTP WAS TO DECREASE OOP SHARING TO LESS THAN 10 PERCENT OF TOTAL INPATIENT COST. this study found this share as 18% so the goal was not attained.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

Reviewer	Reviewer comment(s)	Response
Associate Editor's Comments:	It was NOT. The goal is less than 10 % payment for inpatient settings.	**It is done. Abstract. Page 1.**
	THE MAIN CONCLUSION IS NOT CORRECT. PLEASE REVISE IT IN WHOLE MANUSCRIPT. THE GOAL OF HTP WAS TO DECREASE OOP SHRING TO LESS THAN 10 PERCENT OF TOTAL INPATIENT COST.	**It is done. Abstract. Page 1.**
	Goal for Share of inpatient setting payment in university affiliated hospital was less than 10 percent in HTP.	**It is done. Introduction. Page 2.**
	Yes it is correct. But this goal was not achieved according to your study.	**It is done. Introduction. Page 2.**
	So you cannot compare the effect of season. Omit its effect from the result.	**It is done. Material and Methods. Page 3.**
	Please omit this part. You had a check list and assessment of reliability of a check list is not needed	**It is done. Material and Methods. Page 3.**
	Provide level of significance.	**It is done. Material and Methods. Page 3.**
	It is noteworthy to mention that however there was decrease in percentage of inpatient OOP, the monetary value of OOP payments have been increased after HTP. Please consider this important issue in discussion part. For further information you can read studies entitled: 1- A study on hospitalized patients' payment in south of Iran after the first round of health sector reform. KB Lankarani, S Ghahramani, B Honarvar. Iranian journal of public health 46 (2), 276. 2- Inpatient out-of-pocket in Iran after health transformation plan. S Ghahramani, KB Lankarani. International Journal of Health Policy and Management 7 (9), 877	**It is done. Discussion. Page 5.**
	Third paragraph, what do you mean by "Another study using showed that"?	**It is done. Discussion. Page 5**
	These hospitals were on limited population and had different design in compare of your study. Please provide discussion in compare of your results.	**It is done. Discussion. Page 5**
	This is not correct. The percent decrease and not the money paid.	**It is done. Discussion. Page 6**

	Whole OOP and not inpatient OOP. So it could not be compared.	**It is done. Discussion. Page 6**
	This was not your study goal so it is not needed to mention this.	**It is done. Discussion. Page 6**
	Please be more specific. OOP was more in …	**It is done. Discussion. Page 6**
	This is direct non-medical cost which was not included in this study. SO it is a limitation of this study. How you can justify higher OOP in rural residents?	**It is done. Discussion. Page 6**
	Please provide limitations of study.	**Done in last paragraph of discussion.**

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) 21 Feb 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.