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.102097
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 9(1); e102097

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Team-Based Learning on the Performance of Medical Students in the Medical Physics Course"

Author(s): Maryam Tabibi, Seyed Ali Shafiei, Amir Hamta, Sara Amaniyan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 2 May 2020
Accepted Date: 2 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

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

Farzad Jalilian : Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is interesting and I recommend it for publishing.
- Keywords should be selected from MeSH terms.
- The names of the university should be stated in the abstract.
- The "Scale" used for data colocation should be stated and a short explanation should be given for the reliability and validity.
- The eligibility criteria should be stated.
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors applied Team-based learning (TBL) as an active and participatory learning process on medical students' performance for medical physics courses. Based on the results the students' scores increased by increased significantly by using TBL method. The authors suggest that the implementation of TBL in the medical physics course led to improved learning motivation and higher satisfaction. The main idea and organization of the paper are good, so it is recommended for publishing.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
This study needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Apr 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.

Dear Dr. Mansour Rezaei

We thank you for your recent letter regarding our manuscript (number of 102097) **“The Effect of Team-Based Learning on Medical Students’ Performance for Medical Physics Course”**
My colleagues and I, really appreciate you for carefully reviewing our manuscript. We have carefully read the manuscript and we have corrected it according to your recommendations and the reviewers’ instructions. We hope that these improvements will now lead to a full evaluation of our manuscript by your reviewers. If feedback indicates that any elaboration is needed, we will be happy to provide it.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Seyed Ali Shafiei
Corresponding author

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript is interesting and I recommend it for publishing.
Q1: Keywords should be selected from MeSH terms.

A1: Keywords have been revised base on MeSH

Q2: The names of the university should be stated in the abstract.

A2: The names of the university was added in the abstract.

Q3: The "Scale" used for data colocation should be stated and a short explanation should be given for the reliability and validity.

A3: Harter’s Motivation Questionnaire section have been changed based on reviewer recommendation

Q4: The eligibility criteria should be stated.

A4: End of Subject section have been change for this aim.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:
The authors applied Team-based learning (TBL) as an active and participatory learning process on medical students’ performance for medical physics course. Based on the results

the students' scores increased by increased significantly by using TBL method. The authors suggest that the implementation of TBL in the medical physics course led to improved learning motivation and higher satisfaction. The main idea and organization of paper is good, so it is recommended for publishing.

We appreciate you for your considering our manuscript

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) 2 Jun 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) 2 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 Jun 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.