Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 23 · Issue 2 · e98400

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Health-Related Quality of Life and Death Anxiety Among Hemodialysis Patients

zahra ghiasi, Ali Alidadi, Abolfazl Payandeh, Afshin Emami, Shahab Lotfinia

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Sep 2019	8 Apr 2020	14 Jun 2020	10.5812/zjrms.98400

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** Reza Bidaki, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Reza Bidaki, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Reza Bidaki 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8
4 **Revision 3** Reza Bidaki 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11
5 **Revision 4** Reza Bidaki, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

2 comments · 2 Oct 2019 – 6 Oct 2019

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Oct 2019

Thank you for your valuable study.
Please modify and shorten the background in the abstract section.
The keywords do not conform to MeSH.

Results: Please correct the titles of the tables.

Ensure correct and proper English writing.
It does not fully follow the journal's format.
Correct the referencing and citations.

The discussion is poor.
Regards

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 6 Oct 2019

Major Revision

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.

:Reviewer 1

.Q: Please modify and shorten background in abstract section

A: modified

.Q:The keywords aren't as MeSH

A: edited

.Q: Results : Please Correct the title of tables

A:edited

Q:Correct and proper English writing
.It isn't as journal format, completely
Correct referencing and citations

A:edited

. Q:Discussion is poor

A: edited- possible reason of results added- similar articles added- limitation and conclusion part added

Thank you for your consideration

:Reviewer 2
In the regression model, you should first have examined the relationship of each variable individually with the response. If an association was observed in the single tests, or P values less than 0.2 (if there are not many of them), you would enter them into the model and then use .backward or forward methods
?Did you also use a Post Hoc test
If the questionnaires have previously been translated and used in Iran and their validity and reliability have been examined, report them as references to confirm validity and reliability
In the tables, what do the letters represent, e.g., B , P

A:edited- the results part was completely changed based on your guidlines

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 25 Nov 2019 – 26 Nov 2019

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Nov 2019

Thanks for your effort.
It is valuable research. But the Discussion is still poor.
Regards

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 26 Nov 2019

Major Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 26 Nov 2019

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.

:Reviewer 1

:Q

Why, in Table two, are some correlation coefficients higher but not significant, e.g., eight tenths Perhaps a variable should have been entered into the model, or some items were not attended to, such as the sum of the scores

:A

It was a typing problem. Corrected

Thanks for your consideration

:Reviewer 2

:Q

Thanks for your effort

.It is a valuable research. But ,Discussion is poor,yet

:A

Improved

Thanks for your consideration

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 30 Dec 2019

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 30 Dec 2019

Thanks for the revision.
It still does not fully conform to the journal's format.
It needs to be edited for grammatical errors.
The discussion is still poor.
Regard

4

Revision 3

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.

:Reviewer 1

It is suggested that you consult a statistics expert regarding the results and the way of reporting them

In Table one, it is better to report the mean with standard deviation instead of reporting the value of the t statistic. This way of reporting is not common; or they should not be reported at all, and only the mean and standard deviation of .dimension three, which was significant for sex, should be reported in the text

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level" under Table three is wrong; the term "
Correlation [is] significant was used for a t-test. The t-test is for comparing two .means and has nothing to do with a correlation test

?In Table two, was the correlation value of 0.68 not significant

?Why are the coefficient of determination values in Table three low

A: A statistics professor was consulted and the calculations were re-examined. The coefficient of determination values in Table three were re-examined, but there was no change in the results

.The other errors mentioned were corrected

With thanks

:Reviewer 2

Q : Thanks for revision

.It isn't as journal format completely,yet

.It need to edit for grammatical errors

.the discussion is poor ,yet

Regard

A: The discussion was examined with critical revision

The grammatical problems have been resolved, and the article is in accordance with the journal format

With thanks

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 25 Mar 2020

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Mar 2020

Thanks for your attempt.
Please highlight and underline the requested revisions.
Please send it after doing so.
Regards

5

Revision 4

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.

Reviewer 1:

Dear reviewer

Thanks for your acceptance.

Reviewer 2:

Thanks for your attempt
Please do highlight and underline for requested revisions.
Please send it after do it.
Regards

Dear reviewer

We highlighted the changes

5 Revision 4

3 comments · 19 May 2020 – 14 Jun 2020

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 May 2020

Thanks for your effort.
Please review the journal's formatting requirements again and revise the manuscript to follow them exactly.
Regards

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 13 Jun 2020

accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 14 Jun 2020

Accept