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

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.113606
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(3); e113606

Peer Review Report for "Residency Education Reform Program in Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care: An Academic Reform Model"

Author(s): Ali Dabbagh, Roghayeh Gandomkar , Behrooz Farzanegan, Alireza Jaffari, Nilofar Massoudi, Alireza Mirkheshti, Mohammadreza Moshari, Masoud Nashibi, Seyed Sajad Razavi, Parissa Sezari, Soodeh Tabashi, Ardeshir Tajbakhsh, Maryam Vosoughian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 5 May 2021
Accepted Date: 19 May 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the manuscript entitled: Residency Education Reform Program in Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care: an academic reform model in Iran to the Journal: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine. I think the authors should consider the following points about their manuscript.
- Title: In manuscript title: Residency Education Reform Program in Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care: an academic reform model in Iran, but you did this study just in of medical university, not Iran.
- Methods: How did you measure the reform program end results such as Teaching method, Passing comprehensive exams, Mentorship, Assessment methods, Faculty development, Professionalism in medical education, Integration in education, and Crisis management??
- Result: This part of the manuscript is like an introduction not result also some part of the result is like method.
- Discussion: This part of the study has been written like a report, not a research study.
Final decision: It can be considered as a brief report
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Mar 2021

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.

Comment	How it was managed	The section in the article
Title: In manuscript title: Residency Education Reform Program in Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care: an academic reform model in Iran, but you did this study just in of medical university, not Iran.	The title was fully corrected per recommendation by the reviewers	Title of the manuscript
Methods: How did you measure the reform program results such as Teaching method, Passing comprehensive exams, Mentorship, Assessment methods, Faculty development, Professionalism in medical education, Integration in education, and Crisis management??	In methods, it is updated and fully described that how we measured the results.	In the final paragraph of methods
Result: This part of the manuscript is like an introduction not result also some part of the result is like method.	This section was fully revised and this could be found in the text	Throughout the result section
Discussion: This part of the study has been written like a report, not a research study.	This section was fully revised and this could be found in the text	Throughout the discussion section

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) 19 May 2021

Dear AE,
This revised manuscript was reviewed, and necessary corrections were made
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 May 2021

Dear EIC,
Fortunately, the author could correct all requested items, and based on reviewers' comments, this revised format is acceptable for publishing.
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 May 2021

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