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.107120
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 9(2); e107120

Peer Review Report for "The Root Causes of Absenteeism in Medical Students: Challenges and Strategies Ahead"

Author(s): Mohammd Hadi Bahadori, Arsalan Salari, Iman Alizadeh, Fatemeh Moaddab , Leila Rouhi Balasi, Mostafa Soodmand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 Jul 2020
Revised Date:	27 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	28 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.

Mohammad Rasool Khazaei: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 8 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This study is capable of publishing after major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 8 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
- Abstract: Needs correction. The study is old. Correct goals. Methodology to be modified. Correct the findings and conclusions. Keywords should be based on mesh. View comments in the text.
- Background: The problem is not well explained. Studies to express the problem do not show the existential gap of this study. Further studies are needed to explain the problem. See the text comments of the article.
- Objective: According to the title, writing a goal (first goal) is enough.
- Method: Needs major improvements. See comments in the text of the article.
- Results: It is not permissible to provide a table to display all data. Since non-parametric tests are used, according to the scale of measurement, the mean and standard deviation

have no place. Other central tendency measures should be used instead. For example, the mean does not make sense for gender, marital status. Here, because the scale is nominal, the number or percentage is used.
- Discussion: Opposite studies should be presented and the cause of alignment and inequality should be explained. This section should end with the content of the researcher. The findings are not well justified.
- Conclusion: The conclusion is very long and out of the ordinary of scientific journals. Please provide only a conclusion based on the findings of this study and the solution arising from this study in the form of an abstract and the rest of the material should be deleted.
- References: Due to the fact that many studies have been done in this field, it is necessary to use more valid new related references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should correct the manuscript according to the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Oct 2020

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.

Dear the Editor-in-chief,

Journal of Educational Research in Medical Sciences:

Thanks for your valuable comments. Changes made to the original article have been highlighted.

In response to first reviewer comments:

- All comments are imposed and Highlighted in the article.

Abstract:

- Needs correction. The study is old. Correct goals. Methodology to be modified. Correct the findings and conclusions. Keywords should be based on mesh. View comments in the text.

Background:

- The problem is not well explained. Studies to express the problem do not show the existential gap of this study. Further studies are needed to explain the problem. See the text comments of the article.

Objective:

- According to the title, writing a goal (first goal) is enough.

Method:

- Needs major improvements. See comments in the text of the article.

Results:

- It is not permissible to provide a table to display all data. Since non-parametric tests are used, according to the scale of measurement, the mean and standard deviation have no place. Other central tendency measures should be used instead. For example, the mean does not make sense for gender, marital status. Here, because the scale is nominal, the number or percentage is used.
  - ✓ In response to the comment: Thanks to the comment of the dear reviewer. Respecting, it should be noted that as mentioned in the title of the table, the mean and standard deviation mentioned for each variable is the mean score of the variable and its subscales of the questionnaire of components affecting absence; not, for example, the mean number of single and married people, which should be expressed in terms of frequency and percentage. The purpose of this table is to express the relationship between the mean score of components affecting student absenteeism with demographic factors, which is given in detail and specifying the component score based on demographic variables and its subscales.

Discussion:

- Opposite studies should be presented and the cause of alignment and inequality should be explained. This section should end with the content of the researcher. The findings are not well justified.

Conclusion:

- The conclusion is very long and out of the ordinary of scientific journals. Please provide only a conclusion based on the findings of this study and the solution arising from this study in the form of an abstract and the rest of the material should be deleted.

References:

- Due to the fact that many studies have been done in this field, it is necessary to use more valid new related references.

In response to second reviewer comments:

- All comments are imposed and Highlighted in the article.

Sincerely yours,
Corresponding author

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)** 18 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
Unfortunately, most of the comments are ignored and the revisions are not approved. Especially in the sections of abstract, introduction, methods, results, and the discussion, these revisions are not enough. please revise again and send it back.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 the Editor-in-chief,

Journal of Educational Research in Medical Sciences:

Thanks for your valuable comments. Changes made to the original article have been highlighted.

In response to first reviewer comments:

- All comments are imposed and Highlighted in the article.

Abstract:

- Needs correction. The study is old. Correct goals. Methodology to be modified. Correct the findings and conclusions. Keywords should be based on mesh. View comments in the text.

Background:

- The problem is not well explained. Studies to express the problem do not show the existential gap of this study. Further studies are needed to explain the problem. See the text comments of the article.

Objective:

- According to the title, writing a goal (first goal) is enough.

Method:

- Needs major improvements. See comments in the text of the article.

Results:

- It is not permissible to provide a table to display all data. Since non-parametric tests are used, according to the scale of measurement, the mean and standard deviation have no place. Other central tendency measures should be used instead. For example, the mean does not make sense for gender, marital status. Here, because the scale is nominal, the number or percentage is used.
  - ✓ In response to the comment: Thanks to the comment of the dear reviewer. Respecting, it should be noted that as mentioned in the title of the table, the mean and standard deviation mentioned for each variable is the mean score of the variable and its subscales of the questionnaire of components affecting absence; not, for example, the mean number of single and married people, which should be expressed in terms of frequency and percentage. The purpose of this table is to express the relationship between the mean score of components affecting student absenteeism with demographic factors, which is given in detail and specifying the component score based on demographic variables and its subscales.

Discussion:

- Opposite studies should be presented and the cause of alignment and inequality should be explained. This section should end with the content of the researcher. The findings are not well justified.

Conclusion:

- The conclusion is very long and out of the ordinary of scientific journals. Please provide only a conclusion based on the findings of this study and the solution arising from this study in the form of an abstract and the rest of the material should be deleted.

References:

- Due to the fact that many studies have been done in this field, it is necessary to use more valid new related references.

In response to second reviewer comments:

- All comments are imposed and Highlighted in the article.

Sincerely yours,
Corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 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.