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.107978
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 10(1); e107978

Peer Review Report for "Internal Assessment of the Orthodontics Department of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Iran"

Author(s): Amin Golshah , Hamid Maleki , Farshad Rahimi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 16 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 13 Jun 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This paper was interesting in title and content.
It shows the importance of the educational programs and self-assessment of every department. their approach to this assessment is interesting and the result can be noted by other faculties.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 5 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript article can be printed as a letter to the editor.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
In this article, the authors presented the results of the internal assessment of the orthodontics department of the medical school. Thanks to the authors for trying to identify

the strengths and weaknesses points of the orthodontics department, I do not think the results of this study are suitable for publication as an original article. I suggest that the article be submitted as a letter to the editor.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 11 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Please correct the manuscript according to the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
The manuscript article can be printed as a letter to the editor. 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.

Dear Editor

I changed the manuscript type to letter.

Thanks

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 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The letter needs English editing and correcting the grammatical mistakes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 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.