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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.63225
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(3); e63225

Peer Review Report for "An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observation in Zahedan During 2014 - 2016"

Author(s): Mojgan Salari, Mohammad Hossein Dehghan, Seyyed Mohammad Hashemi Shahri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	24 Oct 2017
Revised Date:	9 Apr 2019
Accepted Date:	24 Apr 2019

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) — 29 Dec 2017

Dear AE,
I think that this study is a new view on patients with tuberculosis and is eligible for publishing in the Zahedan journal of research in medical sciences. But it is better to review by an epidemiologist too and we have their opinions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Jan 2018

Dear AE,
This study described here (An Analysis of the Recovery Time among Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Combined Observation in Zahedan, 1393-1395) appears to have been done well.
Although the intention of the authors in this field is appropriate, the manuscript lacks several drawbacks. The entire manuscript is written very poorly with lots of grammatical errors.

Comments'

1) The title is wrong… As you know your journal is English, hence, why you used Persian year on the text??? Please change to AD…

2) Keywords should be written according to title study. Also, all keywords should be provided according to MeSH terms at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html.

3) Introduction: I suggest to shorten the introduction section. Also, the authors missed some references on the text.

4) Could you describe your statistical analysis??

5) On the text, I found several words were written Persian.

6) Use one space between a number and its unit.

7) Materials and methods should be explained by separate references. It is very compulsory!!

8) The discussion is brief, and also the authors must use new reports of research articles after the year 2015. Maximum 4-6 papers for comparing your results study.

9) Offers section is not compulsory on the text. Also, I think the authors should use this part in the discussion.

10) Check all references according to author structure.

In my suggestion, this manuscript need to major revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Jan 2018

Dear AE,

- This study is interested but it has a lot errors and problems.
- The title of article is not related with the objective of study. Time should be at ad. nor in Shams.
- The length of abstract is very long. The purpose of article should be at the end of introduction session in abstract and full text.
- All the abstract is long and not informative. Some places it is repeated.
- Introduction: the paragraphs and sentences have not reference. The ref. started from 7.
- The introduction also is not related to the purpose of study and very obscure. The authors did not clarify the necessary and novelty of study. The authors more explained about the importance of TB.
- Methods: All the time should be ad. Not at Iranian calendar. "from 1393 until Khordad, 1395".
- The definition of recovery time needs to reference.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2018

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)** 8 Jan 2018

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 Associate Editor and Reviewers,

The first of all I'd like to thank you for the constructive criticism, the paper is titled: **An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observation in Zahedan throughout 2014-2016.**

I carefully restudied, reviewed and corrected the mentioned errors throughout the article.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
This study described here (An Analysis of the Recovery Time among Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Combined Observation in Zahedan, 1393-1395) appears to have been done well.

Although the intention of the authors in this field is appropriate, the manuscript lacks several drawbacks. The entire manuscript is written very poorly with lots of grammatical errors.

Comments'

1) The title is wrong… As you know your journal is English, hence, why you used Persian year on the text??? Please change to AD. It is done.

The new title is: **An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observation in Zahedan throughout 2014-2016.**

2) Keywords should be written according to title study. Also, all keywords should be provided according to MeSH terms at: http://www.nluse the m.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html.

Unfortunately I can't use the MeSH. But it is modified.
3) Introduction: I suggest to shorten the introduction section. Also, the authors missed some references on the text. The missed references are added and area little bit reduced.
4) Could you describe your statistical analysis? I briefly explained it.
5) On the text, I found several words were written Persian. Some of them are names of places or Persian names but the others were correct.
6) Use one space between a number and its unit. It is done.
7) Materials and methods should be explained by separate references. It is very compulsory!!

It is done.
8) The discussion is brief, and also the authors must use new reports of research articles after the year 2015. Maximum 4-6 papers for comparing your results study.

9) Offers section is not compulsory on the text. Also, I think the authors should use this part in the discussion. It is done.
10) Check all references according to author structure. It is done.

Reviewer 2:
I think that this study is a new view on patients with tuberculosis and is eligible for publish in Zahedan journal of research in medical sciences. But it is better to review by an epidemiologist too and we have their opinions.

Reviewer 3:
Dear Editor
The title of article is not related with the objective of study. It is modified.

Time should be at ad. nor in Shams. It is corrected.
The length of abstract is very long. . It is modified.

The purpose of article should be at the end of introduction session in abstract and full text.

It is modified
All the abstract is long and not informative. It is modified.

Some places it is repeated. It is corrected.
Introduction: the paragraphs and sentences have not reference.

The ref. started from 7. The missed references are added and the others are modified.
The introduction also is not related to the purpose of study and very obscure. It is modified.

The authors did not clarify the necessary and novelty of study. It is modified.

The authors more explained about the importance of TB.
Methods: All the time should be ad. Not at Iranian calendar. "from 1393 until Khordad, 1395".
The definition of recovery time need to reference. . It is 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 3 Apr 2018

Dear AE,
#I request check all references according to author structure#
In my opinion, I feel this work will be suitable for publication in Zahedan J Res Med Sciences.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 30 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Why have you used pair t-test in table 1? for male and female, for with diabetes and without diabetes,...
2. The statistic tests and software can be removed from abstract
3. Formulas can be removed from method. Please add references of articles which have described this method in detail.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 31 Oct 2018

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** (1) 31 Oct 2018

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Dear Associate Editor and Reviewers,

The first of all I'd like to thank you for the constructive criticism in second time, the paper is titled: **An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observation in Zahedan throughout 2014-2016.**

I carefully restudied, reviewed and modified the mentioned subjects throughout the article.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Authors,

#I request check all references according to author structure# All the references were checked and the references 29 and 30 are added.

In my opinion, I feel this work will be suitable for publication in Zahedan J Res Med Sciences.

Reviewer 2:

1.Why have you used pair t-test in table 1? for male and female, for with diabetes and without diabetes,...

There are two ways to show the difference between the survival probabilities with and without the use of the above factors. The first one is by a graph and the second is by a formal statistical test. Although you can see the difference between the survival functions (probability), with and without the mentioned factors, but it is a visual judgement; that is not a precise criterion, finally it is a personal opinion. So one can ask although the Figures show the existing difference, are we sure, the differences are significant? To answer the question, after the estimation of the survival probabilities, we have considered a sequence of the real time and calculate the survival probability for the common sequence based on the survival probabilities curve. Then we used the paired T-Test for the two ordered survival probabilities.

The Table 1, contains the related formal critical answer, meaning that the statistical test support and confirm a significant difference between the survival probabilities in the 5 Figures.

2.The statistic tests and software can be removed from abstract

It is done.

3.Formulas can be removed from method. Please add references of articles which have described this method in detail.

It is done and added the two new references.

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) 3 Dec 2018

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** (2) 3 Dec 2018

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 Associate Editor,

The first of all I'd like to thank you for the constructive criticism, the paper is titled: **An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observation in Zahedan throughout 2014-2016.**

I carefully restudied, reviewed and reduced the manuscript as bellow. Please check the following answers.

Corresponding Author

Mohammad Hossein Dehghan

Dear Dr. Mohammad Hossein Dehghan,

We would like to inform you that the above submission has been checked by the screening department and the EIC and based on the EIC decision the manuscript has been sent back to you. Please consider the below red [not OK] part(s).
If you have any questions, please contact us at: www.publisher.support

Files Checking:

[Results of Manuscript Files: Not OK]

-- Appendices

The authors should state the following at the end of the manuscript.

1. **Conflict of Interests:** I have not receive any financial support or been sponsorships.
2. **Ethical Approval:** I have communicated and made arrangements with Dr. Bakhshanipour
3. **Informed Consent:** I have communicated and made arrangements with Dr. Bakhshanipour

Word Count Standards Checking:

[Manuscript Files: Not OK]

Your manuscript does not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions.

- Word Counts

I have read the manuscript carefully and tried to reduce the manuscript words as much as possible without hindering its coherence. Finally, I could reduce it to 3627 words. So I hope it will be suitable for publication in the great journal of "**Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences"**

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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** (3) 8 Apr 2019

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** (3) 8 Apr 2019

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 (4)

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.

Esteemed Associate Editor and Reviewers,

The first of all I'd like to thank you for the constructive criticism given the third time. The paper is titled: An Analysis of the Survival Probability of Tuberculosis Patients with Right Censored and Interval Censored Observations in Zahedan throughout 2014-2016.

I carefully revised and modified the mentioned concerns.

I hope that this time it will be satisfactory for the reviewers.

Best regards

MH. Dehghan

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:

"Independent two sample T-Test" isn't correct. "Independent sample T-Test" is correct.
Please omit CI0.95(μ1-μ2) and Test Result ,and just report mean±sd and p-value in table1for male and female ,with diabetes and without diabetes,... .
Please omit table2.

The Response:

1. The sentence *"Independent two sample T-Test" is corrected, two tables are merged and is modified.*

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (4) 23 Apr 2019

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (4) 24 Apr 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 24 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.