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.116558
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 10(1); e116558

Peer Review Report for "Correlations Between Critical Thinking, Self-esteem, Educational Status, and Demographic Information of Medical Students: A Study from Southwestern Iran"

Author(s): Ali Khavanin, Mehdi Sayyah , Shabnam Ghasemi, Ali Delirrooyfard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 May 2021
Revised Date: 22 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 27 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.

Yahya Safari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

11 Jun 2021

Dear AE,

- Abstract: Critical thinking and personal characteristics are essential for informed decision-making and professional success. Why should it be like this ?? The goal is different from the title. Report the values of r and p. For other variables in the title, report the results.
- Introduction: The issue is not well articulated. The introduction is weak. Insufficient sources have been used to explain the problem. Not all variables are covered. The importance of the issue has not been stated.
- Methods: This study is not epidemiological. It is a descriptive correlation. Expressing the age range is not a good criterion for this. Because students are in this age range and there is no need to mention this restriction.
- Result: Critical thinking is not divided into positive, two-way, and negative. Perhaps a positive or negative tendency to critical thinking is meant. There is no figure (1). Why should we expect living or not living in a dormitory to affect critical thinking? Table (1) is not illustrative. Heterogeneous information is provided in this table. There are problems with the content of Table (2). The relationship between age and critical thinking or gender with self-esteem is not appropriate.

- The table is not illustrative at all. Are the type of test that this table results from and the numbers that are not known a correlation coefficient or a significant level?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The entire article should be reviewed, revised, and updated.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
This study needs major revision. Please correct the manuscript according to the comments.
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.

:Reviewer 1

Abstract: Critical thinking and personal characteristics are essential for informed decision making and professional success. Why should it be like this?? The goal is different with the title. Report the values of r and p. For other variables in the title, report the results

ANSWER: Thanks for your helpful tips; the corrections in the abstract of the article were corrected and highlighted.

Introduction: The issue is not well articulated. Introduction is weak. Insufficient sources have been used to explain the problem. Not all variables are covered. The importance of the issue has not been stated.

ANSWER: Thanks for your helpful tips; the corrections in the Introduction of the article were corrected and highlighted.

Methods: This study is not epidemiological. It is a descriptive correlation. Expressing age range is not a good criterion for this. Because students are in this age range and there is no need to mention this restriction.

ANSWER: Since the age of medical students in the university under study is very mutable, the determining age range was considered in the study. The study type was modified.

Result: Critical thinking is not divided into positive, two-way and negative. Perhaps a positive or negative tendency to critical thinking is meant.

ANSWER: This will definitely be considered in future studies

There is no figure (1). Why should we expect living or not living in a dormitory to affect critical thinking?

ANSWER: Figure 1 is pasted at the end of the text

Table (1) is not illustrative. Heterogeneous information is provided in this table.

ANSWER: The information in Table 1 was modified and divided into two tables

There are problems with the content of Table (2). The relationship between age and critical thinking or gender with self-esteem is not appropriate.

ANSWER: The Table 3 was modified

The table is not illustrative at all. Is the type of test that this table results from and the numbers that are not known a correlation coefficient or a significant level?

ANSWER: Spearman correlation test, Mann-Whitney, and multivariate regression were used to investigate the data. However, there was no significant association between students' Age, Gender, Marital Status, and Residence against critical thinking scores

:Reviewer 2

The entire article should be reviewed, revised and updated.

ANSWER: The first reviewer's corrections were made. Please mention new points for correction if needed.

:Associate Editor's Comments

:Associate Editor 1

.Please correct the manuscript according to the comments

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)** 27 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.