Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 27 · Issue 2 · e157533

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Barriers to Painless Labor in a University Hospital in Northern Iran

Fatemeh Hosseinzadeh, Samaneh Ghazanfar Tehran, Soheil Soltanipour, Roya Niknam, Mahin Tayefeh Ashrafiyeh, Gelareh Biazar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Oct 2024	28 Dec 2024	25 Jan 2025	10.5812/zjrms-157533

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear EIC, thanks for the review process. We did our best to consider all the valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised and the changes are highlighted, hoping you find it enough acceptable to be published in your prestigious journal.

In introduction section

• It Very briefly.

This section has been revised and two references are added

In methods section

• Name of Study design be reported in abstract and full article.

Thanks, done.

• Report tools? Checklist or questionnaire? Validity & reliability? • What is data gathering?

The data collection tool of this study was a checklist containing two parts, first the demographic data (gender, years of experience, specialized fields and degree), and second , 8 items about the barriers to PL in this hospital including Lack of anesthesiologists , not informing pregnant women about the possibility of painless labor, unwillingness of obstetricians to schedule pregnant women for painless delivery , obstetrics' worry about the interference of this method with the delivery process , maternal refusal, Lack of necessary facilities, lack of technician of anesthesiology, lack of midwives.

• Report name of sampling.

Sampling was conducted using a census method , and included all the members working at Al-Zahra hospital in three groups of obstetrics, anesthesiology and midwifery

• Is this article part of another research? be mentioned.

No, this study is not taken from another work.

In results section

• Title is analytical title in table 3 and 4. what is test? what is statistical methods? It be reported.

It was just a descriptive study and the frequency of the answers were reported. Based on the respected reviewer's comment the title of the tables have been corrected.

Warm Regards

G B MD

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 11 Dec 2024 – 15 Dec 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 11 Dec 2024

Thank you for your valuable manuscript and submission to this journal. There are some items that require revision, which are outlined below:
1. The necessity of implementing the plan in the introduction section needs further explanation.
2. The criteria for participant selection are not explicitly detailed in the abstract.
3. The sampling method should be explained, and further details on the statistical methods should be provided.
4. In the discussion section, it is essential to delineate studies whose results are similar to or inconsistent with those of the current study.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 15 Dec 2024

Dear Dr. Gelareh Biazar,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal to each point raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Bita Moudi, PhD
Associate Editor
Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences

Reviewers' comments:
Reviewer 1.
Thank you for your valuable manuscript and submission to this journal. There are some items that require revision, which are outlined below:
1. The necessity of implementing the plan in the introduction section needs further explanation.
2. The criteria for participant selection are not explicitly detailed in the abstract.
3. The sampling method should be explained, and further details on the statistical methods should be provided.
4. In the discussion section, it is essential to delineate studies that are similar and those that are inconsistent with the results of the current study.
Decision:
Major revision

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear EIC

Thanks a lot for review process. We did our best to revise the manuscript based on respected reviewers 'comments. Hoping to be acceptable in your prestigious journal.

Best regards

Gelareh Biazar MD

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for your valuable manuscript and submission to this journal. There are some items that require revision, which are outlined below:
1. The necessity of implementing the plan in the introduction section needs further explanation.' *Thanks, done*

2. The criteria for participant selection are not explicitly detailed in the abstract.

Thanks, done

3. The sampling method should be explained, and further details on the statistical methods should be provided

Thanks, done

4. In the discussion section, it is essential to delineate studies that are similar and those that are inconsistent with the results of the current study

Thanks, done

Reviewer 2:
Dears
Corrections have been made and approved.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.