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.98500
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(10); e98500

Peer Review Report for "Survival Rate of Patients With HIV/AIDS and Related Factors in Tehran, Iran"

Author(s): Ali Moradi, Seyed Saeed Hashemi Nazari, Farnaz Zandvakili, Pegah Ameri, Ali Nikfarjam, Sonia Darvishi, Mehdi Noroozi, Khaled Rahmani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	17 Mar 2020
Accepted Date:	18 Mar 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. Follow up time and time of the study are not clear in the abstract.
2. Report main findings of models using appropriate index.
3. Reporting the exact P-value in the text is necessary.
4. Survival rates of 1, 5, and 10 years are 92%, 74%, and 50%? Table 3 reports different numbers.
5. Report HR and P-value in the text.
6. There was no information about the variable selection method in the COX model.
7. Describe the results of the COX model in detail.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Abstract and introduction:
1. Use the style of Journal correctly (line 7 page 4)

Method

2. Page 5 line 4 what do you mean by “Mar”?

3. What criteria did you consider for the age of HIV cases? It is better not to consider child infected from their mothers in this study

4. You wrote “outcome included the time between the definitive diagnosis of HIV infection and AIDS” First this is survival time, not the outcome, your outcome is mortality. Second, your time is from HIV diagnosis or AIDS? They are two different categories.

5. You mention that your outcome is ‘HIV/AIDS-induced mortality’ do you mean HIV-related death or all-cause mortality?

6. Define what is your censor or lose to follow up cases preciously.

Results

7. One of your exclusion criteria was a patient whose place of residence was not covered by the Health Center of southern Tehran. But you report the variable ‘place of residence’ which had the categories ‘Tehran’ and ‘other’ what do you mean by other?

8. Is Table 4 your univariate cox model? Where is the table of your final model?

9. What method and way of variable selection did you used for your final model?

10. Your interpretation of the cox model is not enough!

11. The manuscript need English reversion

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Jan 2020

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 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 (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 Bagheri Lankarani,
Editor-in-chief,

Manuscript Title: Survival Rate of HIV/AIDS Patients and Related Factors in Tehran

First of all, we would like to thank you and the respected reviewers whose technical comments helped us to improve and revise our manuscript. We made the required changes in the manuscript and highlighted them in the text; additionally, in the table below we have listed the revisions and the responses to the comments.

	Comments	Response
Reviewer 1:	*1. Follow up time and time of the study are not clear in the abstract*	It was corrected according to the comment.
	2. Report main findings of models using appropriate index.	It was done.
	3. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.	It was done.
	4. Survival rates of 1, 5 and 10 years are 92%, 74% and 50%? Table 3 report different numbers.	It was corrected.
	5. Report HR and P-value in the text.	We reported p values and HR when was needed.
	6. There was no information about variable selection method in COX model.	It should be noted that before the modeling, we assessed the association between survival time of studied subjects and each of independent variables by univariate analysis. Then variables with P value equal and less than 0.2 were entered to the model. Before the fitting the models, proportionality assumption was checked for each variable using the log–log survival curves and observed versus expected survival curves. Likelihood test was used to gain the fitted model
	7. Describe results of COX model in details.	We added a paragraph to

		the text about the results of COX model.
Reviewer 2:	*1. Use the style of Journal correctly (line 7 page 4)*	It was corrected.
	Method 2. Page 5 line 4 what do you mean by "Mar"?	It means March. It was corrected.
	3. What criteria did you consider for the age of HIV cases? It is better not consider child infected from their mothers in this study	All cases including children who infected from infected mothers and adults were included in the study. It should be noted that there was no any died cases among children during our follow up.
	4. You wrote "outcome included the time between the definitive diagnosis of HIV infection and AIDS" First this is survival time not outcome, your outcome is mortality. Second, your time is from HIV diagnosis or AIDS? They are two different category.	With respect to your comment, this term (outcome) is used for follow up time in survival analysis such as this study. Indeed the outcome variable is time from HIV diagnosis to death.
	5. You mention that your outcome is 'HIV/AIDS-induced mortality' do you mean HIV-related death or all-cause mortality?	We mean HIV-related death or all deaths that had HIV/AIDS as underling cause of death in death registry system.
	Results *6. One of your exclusion criteria was patient whose place of residence was not covered by the Health Center of southern Tehran. But you report the variable 'place of residence' which had the categories 'Tehran' and 'other' what do you mean by other?*	In this exclusion criteria, we mean cases who not any registered address about the place of residence. Cases who had registered place of residence were included in the analysis.
	7. Is Table 4 your univariate cox model? Where is the table of your final model?	Table 4 showed the final model and univariates model is not mentioned in this paper.
	8. What method and way of variable selection did you used for your final model?	We explained it in details in the last paragraph of .method
	9. The manuscript need English reversion	We edited it

With Warmest Regards,
Corresponding Author

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)** 18 Mar 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.