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.117948
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 10(1); e117948

Peer Review Report for "Challenges of Virtual Medical Sciences Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Farhad Salari, Vida Sepahi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Jul 2021
Revised Date:	15 Aug 2021
Accepted Date:	15 Aug 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) 25 Jul 2021

Dear AE,

Abstract:

- The structured abstract is better to be written according to the journal format, i.e.: Background, methods, results, conclusions

Introduction:

- The introduction is very long and has a lot of redundant descriptions.

Method:

- Google Scholar is a search engine, not a database.
- The search method needs to be explained in detail, i.e. how many authors did the search? Is there a limit to the language of the articles? How many articles have been extracted from each database? Criteria for including and excluding articles.
- It is suggested to write a flowchart of identification and selection of articles included in this systematic review.

Results:

- The obtained findings should be addressed in this section.

Discussion and Conclusion:

- It is not needed to have strategies for overcoming challenges in separated paragraphs and suggested to be written very briefly in the conclusion section.

- The English language of the article needs major editing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Aug 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Aug 2021

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

Dear Editor-in-Chief

- Title corrected.

- Inclusion and exclusion criteria described in the manuscript.

- How to evaluate the searched articles was described.

- The table of articles searched in the results section was mentioned.

- The manuscript was edited.

- The cases mentioned by the reviewers were corrected and highlighted in the manuscript.

Kind Regards,

Dr. Vida Sepahi

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)** 15 Aug 2021

Dear Authors,
This article is suitable to be accepted.
Thanks.