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.107035
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 9(2); e107035

Peer Review Report for "Experiences of Medical Students About Computer-based Testing: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Saeideh Daryazadeh, Atiye Faghihi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 8 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Dec 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) — 14 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
1. In the Abstract, The objectives should be at the end of the first paragraph.
2. Delete objectives after background.
3. Mention personal characteristics of the interviewer: Credentials, Occupation, Gender, Experience, and training.
4. State methodological orientation to underpin the study. It seems phenomenology.
5. Describe the method of approaching the selection of participants. How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email.
6. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?
7. What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data
8. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Please state.
9. Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The text of the article is correct and appropriate and can be published.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Oct 2020

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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
This manuscript after some revision can be accepted.
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.

Subject: Revision of manuscript “Experiences of medical students from the computer based test: A qualitative study”, (ID: 107035).

Dear Dr Mansour Rezaei

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to revise my paper on ‘Experiences of medical students from the computer based test: A qualitative study’. The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful and I appreciate their. I have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter and responded to them individually, indicating exactly how I addressed each concern or problem and describing the changes we have made. I have tried to answer the questions to the best of my ability based on the information I have. The amendments are marked in the manuscript in the form of track change and highlight. I hope the revised manuscript will better suit of Educational Research in Medical Sciences and I thank you for your continued interest in my research.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

PEER-REVIEWERS’ EVALUATIONS

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1

The text of the article is correct and appropriate and can be published.

Reviewer 2

Thanks for your thoughtfulness and the good points you mentioned. Response to your comments is as follows:

1. In Abstract,
The objectives should be at the end of the first paragraph.
2. Delete objectives after background.

Response: Thank you so much for comment. Due to the structure and template of the journal, the objectives are placed in a separate section entitled "Objectives".

3. Mention personal characteristics of the interviewer: Credentials, Occupation, Gender, Experience and training.

Response: Thanks for your comment. The interviewer was woman and she is Ph.D student in medical education. She received her master’s degree in medical education between 2011 and 2014. She has 9 years of experience in medical education and also 6 years of experience in

qualitative research. Amendments were also made to the “Methods” section, (Please refer to page:4, line: 79-82)

4. State methodological orientation to underpin the study. It seems phenomenology.

Response: The methodological orientation of this study was “content analysis” method and conventional type. We have stated this at the beginning of the method section. (Please refer to page:3, line: 66-67)

5. Describe the method of approaching the selection of participants. How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email.

Response: Thanks for your thoughtfulness. Method of approaching the selection of participants was by telephone. Interviews were conducted by two ways “face-to-face” and “by-phone” methods (2 face-to-face and 8 by-phone interviews). Amendments were also made to the “Methods” section, (Please refer to page: 4, line: 78-80)

6. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

Response: All participants (n = 10) agreed to participate in the interview and continued until the end. Amendments were also made to the “Methods” section, (Please refer to page: 6, line: 120-121)

7. What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data

Response: The demographic characteristics of the sample included age and sex, which we mentioned in the results section. (Please refer to page: 6, line: 120-121)

8. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Please state.

Response: Yes, all interviews were recorded using audio recorder. This explanation was added in the body of the manuscript. (Please refer to page: 5, line: 92)

9. Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?

Response: Yes, One of the measures in the rigor of the study and for confirm the credibility was member check. We mentioned this in the method section. (Please refer to page: 5, line: 113-114)

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 9 Dec 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.