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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Thrita
Article DOI: 10.5812/thrita.114088
Published in: Thrita: 10(1); e114088

Peer Review Report for "Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of Diabetes Mellitus"

Author(s): Fatemeh Mousavi, Parisa Shojaei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 28 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 9 Jul 2021

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) 11 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs to major revision. There are problems throughout the manuscript, some of which are mentioned
1 - The inclusion criteria needs to be explain completely.
2 - Diabetes mellitus is more common in people over the age of 30, while the inclusion criterion is over the age of 18. Explain the regional reason for determining and selecting it by the researcher
3 - The mean of ages in table one indicates that your non- diabetic group is younger than diabetic group. Also, this gap is seen in all demographics such as education level, income, etc. Therefore, how did the author match the results? And how can it explain the rationality of the results?
4 - In discussion; the authors claim that “The performance of diabetics was related only to age and place of residence and the performance of people living in Tehran was much better”, while the investigation restricted to Tehran. How did the author conclude it?
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The whole text needs to be edited.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision, and some serious problems can be found in the methodology.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Apr 2021

Dear Author:
Thank you very much for submitting your manuscript to the Thrita journal. Please revise your final manuscript based on reviewers' comments and resend its revised draft on our website. You can track your manuscript using your account on the website. As we are facilitating our timely publication, we expect to receive your revised manuscript in 7 days. If we receive your manuscript after a month, we will consider your paper with lower priority.
Regards

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.

The inclusion criteria needs to be explain completely.

2 - Diabetes mellitus is more common in people over the age of 30, while the inclusion criterion is over the age of 18. Explain the regional reason for determining and selecting it by the researcher.

We did not measure knowledge and attitudes in people with diabetes just to consider those over 30, but also people with and without diabetes, so we considered adults over 18, like most of the articles that worked on our topic.

3.the mean of ages in table one indicates that your non- diabetic group is younger than diabetic group. Also, this gap is seen in all demographics such as education level, income, etc. Therefore, how did the author match the results? And how can it explain the rationality of the results?

Our mistake was that in Table 1, we also declared the age variable separately for the two groups. But in most articles, the average age of the whole population and not separately between the two groups, as we wrote in the first line of the results, is stated, and it happens that diabetics, as you said, are over 30 years old and the average age They are higher than non-diabetics.

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) 7 Jul 2021

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) 7 Jul 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Jul 2021

Dear Author,:
Thank you very much for considering the Thrita journal for the publication of your paper I'm pleased to confirm that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Thrita journal.
Regards