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.97889
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(9); e97889

Peer Review Report for "Knowledge, Attitude, and the Real Practice of General Dental Practitioners in Shiraz, Iran Towards Accepting HIV-Positive Patients"

Author(s): Ali Golkari, Mojtaba Homayouni, Zahra Ranjbar, Aira Sabokseir

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Sep 2019
Revised Date:	17 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	22 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Time of the study is not clear.
2. There was no information about sample size calculation.
3. Sample size in the results is 103 or 105?
4. Did you use chi-square and spearman tests? Where?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 11 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- The paper is not well written and structured. Please revise the English language.
- Moreover, the reliability of the questionnaire should be checked.
Abstract
- You only mentioned “The percentages of dentists who claimed would accept HIV+ patient

without hesitation, accept with hesitation if the patient insisted, refer, or reject immediately were 29, 31, 30, and 10 respectively. However, in reality, the observed percentages were 17.5, 0, 65, and 17.5." please report the result of Chi-square and Spearman correlation.

Introduction

- The introduction is relevant. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. Revise the items mentioned in the attached file.

Method

- The methods are generally appropriate, although the reliability of the questionnaire has not been checked. English writing is not correct and needs revision.
- Explain how the study size was arrived at. Please explain about this issue.

Results:

- As you mentioned, "Chi-square and Spearman correlation tests were used to compare the participants' answers in the questionnaires and their real practice towards accepting the HIV+ patients." Please declare the r and P-value. The results of the Chi-square and Spearman correlation were not mentioned therefore, the result needs major revision. The tables need revision. English writing is not correct and needs revision.

Discussion

- After revising the results, revise the discussion. The discussion is not well written and structured. Moreover, discuss the generalisability of the study results.
- Please mention the main results first. References have not been mentioned correctly. The discussion should be revised. Mention the limitations and advantages of the current study.

Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 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.

Dear editor(s)

I would like to thank you and the reviewers on behalf of all authors. We are now edited our manuscript and through this, we felt that the comments you gave us have really improved the quality of the manuscript. We have done our best to revise the manuscript based on the given comments and to meet all of them.

1. A word "the" is deleted from 2nd paragraph of Introduction.
2. A word "rights" is changed to "right" in the 3rd paragraph of introduction.
3. "a 45% of those" is changed to "45% of that" in the 4th paragraph of Introduction.
4. "early 1990s" is changed to "the early 1990s" in the 4th paragraph of Introduction.
5. A sentence in the 6th paragraph of Introduction is revised.
6. A word "participants" is added to the first parts of paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of results.
7. The word "said" is changed to "declared" or "indicated" in the 6th paragraph of results.
8. A phrase "Not surprisingly, a high number of" is deleted from the 6th paragraph of results.
9. The second sentence of the 7th paragraph of results is revised.
10. A paragraph is added to the beginning of discussion to summarize the main findings of the study.
11. A word "candidosis" is changed to "candidiasis" in the 1st paragraph of discussion.
12. Suggestions are moved from the early discussion paragraphs to the end of discussion. This is highlighted in grey.
13. Words "is" and "show" are changed to "was" and "showed" in the 3rd paragraph of discussion.
14. Reference number "(7) is added after "Crossley in the UK" in the 4th paragraph of discussion.
15. A reference that was missing is now added to the 4th paragraph of the discussion and to the reference list. The numbering of the rest of references is corrected accordingly.
16. The 5th paragraph of discussion is totally new. It is added to the discussion to mention some limitations and advances of the current study, based on the reviewers' comments.
17. Title of Table 1 is corrected.
18. Title of Table 2 is corrected.
19. Explanations are added to the column headings of Table 2.
20. A row is added to the top of Table 3 to explain its columns.
21. A row is added to the top of Table 4 to explain its columns.
22. Headings of the columns are corrected in Table 5.

Important: We looked again and as we understand no name or affiliation exist in the file.

It would be great if you could reconsider our manuscript again.

Kind 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 4 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Time of the study is not clear.
2. There was no information about sample size calculation.
3. Sample size in the results is 103 or 105?
4. Did you use chi-square and spearman tests? Where?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 6 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.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear associate editor

Thanks for comments. The type of comments show that you and reviewers really spent time on this manuscript. The authors appreciate that. I would like to point it out that all that reviewers asked to be added (except for the time of study which was missed by mistake) were included in the original thesis and in the first draft of the manuscript. However, they were deleted when the authors tried to shorten the paper and limit the word count. They are now added in brief sentences.

Reviewer 1;
1. The time of the study is not clear.

The time of study is now added to the first sentence of Methods section.

2. There was no information about the sample size calculation.

The explanation is now added to the first paragraph of the methods section.

3. The sample size in the results is 103 or 105?

The correct number is 103. Mentioning 105 in the 9th paragraph of the results section was a typo mistake which is corrected now.

4. Did you use chi-square and spearman tests? Where?

The word "compared" is now replaced by "analyzed" in the last paragraph of methods section.

Some statistical findings are now added to the various parts of the results section. They are all highlighted in yellow. The authors have avoided full inclusion of the results of statistical tests to avoid making the text look crowded.

Reviewer 2;
Please add limitation of the study at the end of the discussion.

Some limitations and suggestions are mentioned in the 5th paragraph of the discussion section.

EIC Decision:

Needs minor revision .

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) 21 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 22 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.