Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 10 · Issue 1 · e111994

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Professors Toward E-learning During COVID-19 and Its Associated Factors from the Perspective of the Students of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences (2020)

Vida Sepahi, Farhad Salari, Ahmad Khoshay, Mansour Rezaei

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
2 Jan 2021	22 Apr 2021	24 Apr 2021	10.5812/erms.111994

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Aalireza Khatoony, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

4 comments · 13 Jan 2021 – 22 Feb 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
- Manuscript Full Title: The title needs to be modified.
- Evaluating professors do not make sense. The virtual class is not a proper term. In general, this title is not suitable for a scientific article.
- Abstract: The goal is not compatible with the title. Some of the content in the abstract does not correspond to the methodology section.Comments are provided in the text of the article.
- Keywords: Write according to MeSh.
- introduction: The introduction to an original scientific article is poor. Comments are written in the text of the article.
- Methods: The methodology needs to be reformed. There are comments in the text.
- Results and tables need to be modified.
- In the table, the correlation coefficient is not reported. Pearson correlation coefficient, the value of ro (ρ) should also be reported.There are comments in the text.
- The discussion is not coherent enough. It needs to be organized
- Abbreviations come at the end of the article. Ethical confirmation should be provided
Thanks.

Aalireza Khatoony Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 23 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
This article can be accepted after some minor revisions.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 22 Feb 2021

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

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 22 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Please take a look at the attached comments.
Thanks.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Necessary reforms were made and highlighted in the manuscript

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 24 Apr 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 Apr 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.