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.117964
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 10(1); e117964

Peer Review Report for "The Quality of Evidence-Based Morning Reports with an Interactive and Consultative Approach in the Viewpoint of Clinical Faculties and Residents: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Saeideh Daryazadeh, Payman Adibi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 26 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 29 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) — 26 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
In recent years, the use of traditional teaching methods based on experience, in modern medical education, its place has been changed to evidence-based methods.
Various studies confirm this issue from many years ago.
Obviously, the use of the evidence-based method is more acceptable than the traditional method of teacher-centered education.
If this issue has replaced the traditional method of education in many hospital training centers in recent years.
Therefore, the recent study is not a new issue in this field.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
many thanks for giving me the opportunity to review this paper
- the topic of the paper is most important, however, the conduction process and the results

are not clear, hope my recommendations will help the authors to elaborate the work.
- title: in tile, I suggest writing, " the quality of morning reports in viewpoints of clinical faculties and residents: a qualitative study"
- abstract: needs some changes, for example, the reasons/gaps of the previous study have not been brought up. other comments are in the uploaded file.
- introduction: This should be focused on the main points of the subject, such as meeting reports, gaps, problems, previous researches on the quality of these programs, and qualitative researches. and also it should be written from whole to parts. other suggestions are in the uploaded file
- methods: this part is more important, it should be written in detail as much as possible. for example: briefly write about your plan with reference, why you selected the content analysis. how you conducted the data collection, what is your rigors and data analysis steps and .....
- results: this part is too incomplete. for each main category, category, and subcategory, you should explain in detail, and write the numbers of codes. your explanations should be on the subcategories, one paragraph for each. it is not acceptable to write just quotations, each paragraph needs author descriptions (about 50 %) that will be confirmed by quotes (50%). this comment should be considered for all results. write the demographic characteristics of the participants. some of the subcategories seem code, and they may be able to merge to each other such as changes in classroom layout, Lack of motivation for the presence of
faculty members and. Totally the results are not analyzed carefully, and the codes are too low for extracting 20 subcategories.
- discussion: should be started with main results, not the repetition of the method, they should be in line with your categories and clearly stated in separate paragraphs.
good luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Aug 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Aug 2021

Dear Authors,
Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".
Correct the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments and resubmit.
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.

Thanks to the respected reviewers
The response to the comments is below and the others is highlighted in the text of the manuscript.

Title: That was an intervention.

[The quality of evidence-based morning reports with interactive and consultative approach in viewpoints of clinical faculties and residents: a qualitative study]

Keywords :These are mesh-based.

Keywords: Morning Report, Evidence-Based Medicine, Change, Clinical Education, Medical Education.

EBM: In the present study, an educational intervention is conducted in the form of evidence-based morning report with a consultative and interactive approach among residents. Therefore, the evaluation was done from the perspective of the participants.

Acknowledgments

ethics code: The code of ethics in NASR Research Center is the same and is the same as the approved code.

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)** 29 Aug 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.