Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 11 · Issue 1 · e120198

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison of Research Self-efficacy of Graduate Students and the Effectiveness of their Supervisors in Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences

Elham Niromand, Seiydeh Sana Hosseini, Sayedeh Sara Hosseiny, Mohammad Rasool Khazaei

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 Oct 2021	19 Mar 2022	13 Apr 2022	10.5812/erms-120198

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 Cyrus Jalili 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

1 comment · 25 Dec 2021

Cyrus Jalili Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Dec 2021

The different parts of this article are written properly.
The article needs grammatical revision.
Keywords must be arranged according to the MeSH method.
Please omit the second dot in line 106.
Please edit the contents of Table 1 in the subscales section and center the contents of all cells.
Reference number 25 is not related to Wei Zhang in line 274.
Please omit the parenthesis in line 277.
There are 26 references cited in the text, while there are 25 references in the References section.

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.

Greetings and Regards

While thanking the esteemed judges, the corrected cases in response to the judges are as follows

Abstract

1- Methods section: Census sampling method and sample size of 116 people were added (second line)
2- The beginning of the third line of students was replaced
3- The name of data analysis software was mentioned spss16 (fourth line)
4- Results: The space between the words at the beginning of the line and the end of the second line was corrected. 4- In lines 3-4-5 and 6, the numerical value of the propositions was added. In the sixth line, Pearson correlation was added.
5- Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.2 was added at the end of the methods
6- Keywords were rewritten based on mesh

methods :

1. Line 6 The extra comma was removed

Results:

1-The second paragraph of lines 2-3-4-5-6-7-8 of the numbers was corrected

2-The numbers 198 and 216 are correct because they are the total score and there is no plus or minus

3- Table 1 was added to the end of the second paragraph

4- The title of Table 1 was modified

7- The table of correction and arrangement of numbers became central

Discussion

1- The spelling of the word discussion was correct

2- At the end of paragraph 4, after reference 21, the wording was corrected and rewritten

3- Reference number 26, which was entered incorrectly, was deleted

Reference

1-The word sources was modified

2-References 1 and 3 were rewritten and corrected

3-All references were checked and transcribed

Thanks Dr. Mohammad Rasool Khazaei

With greetings and respect,

With thanks to the respected reviewers, the corrections made in response to the reviewers are as follows:

Abstract:

1- Methods section: The sampling method (census) and the sample size of 116 people were added (second line).
2- At the beginning of the third line, "students" was substituted.
3- The name of the data analysis software was stated: spss16 (fourth line).
4- Results: The spacing between words at the beginning of the line and at the end of the second line was corrected. 4- In lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, the numerical values of the statements were added, and in the sixth line, the Pearson correlation was added.
5- The Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.2 was added at the end of the Methods.

6- The keywords were rewritten based on MeSH.

Methods:

1- Line 6: the extra comma was removed.

Results:

1- Paragraph 2, lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8: the numbers were corrected.

2- The numbers 198 and 216 are correct, because they are total scores and have no ± value.

3- Table 1 was added to the end of the second paragraph.

4- The title of Table 1 was corrected.

7- The table was corrected, and the numbers were center-aligned.

Discussion:

8- The spelling of the word "Discussion" was corrected.

9- At the end of paragraph 4, after reference 21, the sentence was restructured and rewritten.

10- Reference number 26, which had been inserted by mistake, was deleted.

References

The word "References" was corrected.

References 1 and 3 were rewritten and corrected.

All references were checked and rewritten with EndNote.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

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.

Greetings and Regards

While thanking the esteemed judges, the corrected cases in response to the judges are as follows

Abstract

1- Methods section: Census sampling method and sample size of 116 people were added (second line)
2- The beginning of the third line of students was replaced
3- The name of data analysis software was mentioned spss16 (fourth line)
4- Results: The space between the words at the beginning of the line and the end of the second line was corrected. 4- In lines 3-4-5 and 6, the numerical value of the propositions was added. In the sixth line, Pearson correlation was added.
5- Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.2 was added at the end of the methods
6- Keywords were rewritten based on mesh

methods :

1. Line 6 The extra comma was removed

Results:

1-The second paragraph of lines 2-3-4-5-6-7-8 of the numbers was corrected

2-The numbers 198 and 216 are correct because they are the total score and there is no plus or minus

3- Table 1 was added to the end of the second paragraph

4- The title of Table 1 was modified

7- The table of correction and arrangement of numbers became central

Discussion

1- The spelling of the word discussion was correct

2- At the end of paragraph 4, after reference 21, the wording was corrected and rewritten

3- Reference number 26, which was entered incorrectly, was deleted

Reference

1-The word sources was modified

2-References 1 and 3 were rewritten and corrected

3-All references were checked and transcribed

Thanks Dr. Mohammad Rasool Khazaei

With greetings and respect,

With thanks to the respected reviewers, the corrections made in response to the reviewers are as follows:

Abstract:

1- Methods section: The sampling method (census) and the sample size of 116 people were added (second line).
2- At the beginning of the third line, "students" was substituted.
3- The name of the data analysis software was stated: spss16 (fourth line).
4- Results: The spacing between words at the beginning of the line and at the end of the second line was corrected. 4- In lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, the numerical values of the statements were added, and in the sixth line, the Pearson correlation was added.
5- The Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.2 was added at the end of the Methods.

6- The keywords were rewritten based on MeSH.

Methods:

1- Line 6: the extra comma was removed.

Results:

1- Paragraph 2, lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8: the numbers were corrected.

2- The numbers 198 and 216 are correct, because they are total scores and have no ± value.

3- Table 1 was added to the end of the second paragraph.

4- The title of Table 1 was corrected.

7- The table was corrected, and the numbers were center-aligned.

Discussion:

8- The spelling of the word "Discussion" was corrected.

9- At the end of paragraph 4, after reference 21, the sentence was restructured and rewritten.

10- Reference number 26, which had been inserted by mistake, was deleted.

References

The word "References" was corrected.

References 1 and 3 were rewritten and corrected.

All references were checked and rewritten with EndNote.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.