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

Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/erms.101161
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 9(1); e101161

Peer Review Report for "The Modeling of Succession Management in the Faculty Members of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: A Grounded Theory"

Author(s): Reza Pourmirza Kalhori, Susan Laei, Elham Kavyani, Faramarz Malekian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Jan 2020
Revised Date:	22 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	12 May 2020

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)

8 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
The following information is provided
1. due to the purpose of the study, the title is unfitting
2. There is no objective section in the abstract.
The background section is too short.
The results section in abstract is too long.
3. This manuscript is more than 5000 words which is too long.
4. Methods and materials are too long.
5. There is no explanation on research ethic.
6. There are no new points in conclusion.
7. This writing needs to be edited in English terms.
8. the references need correction.
9. The writer of this manuscript has put a lot of effort into it, but its writing is not suited for an article and the writer needs to reconsider their writing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This study needs minor revision. I put my comments on the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Feb 2020

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** (0) 15 Feb 2020

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 (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.

Article amendments

1- The summary of the article became structured and became more concise.
2- Objectives were clearly defined.
3- Keywords corrected.
4- Due to the quality of the research, the number of words in the article is more than 5,000 words.
5- The ethical issues of this research were mentioned.
6- The method of selecting articles, the structure of the structured interview, and the number of cases in which the interviewer did not participate and other cases noted by the judges were performed as much as possible.

Thank you very much

Reza Pourmirza kalhori

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) 12 May 2020

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) 12 May 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 May 2020

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