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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.101446
Published in: Health Scope: 9(4); e101446

Peer Review Report for "Designing a Quantum Management Model for Organizational Learning Through a Systematic Approach to Grounded Theory: A Case Study of the Zahedan University of Medical Sciences"

Author(s): Maliheh Gharibi, Mehdi Zirak , Hossein Momeni Mahmouei, Yousef Mehdipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Feb 2020
Revised Date:	8 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	8 Jul 2020

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) 2 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
It is an interesting work of authors, and every effort to examine the Designing a Quantum Management Model for Organizational Learning through a systematic approach to grounded theory, which is very good. The study also presented a detailed discussion of these findings and possible reasons across periods. The specific comments and suggestions are presented below:
1- It is advisable to summarize the abstract.
2- It will be better If the authors can provide the definition of applied method in the introduction by considering of Quantum Management Model.
3- It is also a very long introduction and should be summarized.
4- In this study, 19 people were interviewed, including faculty members and managers of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. If possible, please mention the type of managers ' responsibility.
5-The title of table 1 should be completed and revised.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
There are opinions to be addressed by the author:
1. Please summarize every part of the article specifically the background and the result sections.
2. In background, write about the importance of the study and the reason for choosing the University of Zahedan. . Also write about some studies in other universities that have used quantum theory.
3. In the Result, you should explain the findings of the interview based on Themes and Codes.
4. In the Discussion, you should write about the similarities and differences between the findings and other studies. Write about applicable recommendations for the University to be better on the basis of quantum theory.
5.Discussion should be changed completely according to the previous comments (Section 4). Quality is not discussed in Qualitative Research and Triangulation . Also six Themes should be written in Result.
6. Please write the manuscript based on qualitative study.
Good Luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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:

1- It is advisable to summarize the abstract.

1- According to the standard, the number of words in the abstract section is 400 words and the present article is 332 words.

It will be better If the authors can provide the definition of applied method in the --2 .introduction by considering of Quantum Management Model

.The operational definition is presented in the introduction .2

3- It is also a very long introduction and should be summarized.

3- The article was modified according to the qualitative method.

4-In this study, 19 people have been interviewed that included faculty members and managers of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. If it is possible, please mention the type of responsibility of the manager

4- It was corrected.

5-The title of table 1 should be completed and revised

5- The title of the table has been corrected.

Reviewer 2:

1. Please summarize every part of article specially, background and result.

1- According to the standard, the number of words in the abstract section is 400 and the present article is 332 words.

In background, write about the importance of the study and the reason of selection of .2 Zahedan University for this study. Also write about the University more. Also write some studies .in other Universities that were used the Quantum theory

.It was stated in the conclusion -2

3. In Result, you should explain the findings of interview based on Themes and Codes.

3- The article was modified according to the qualitative method.

4. In Discussion, you should write about similarity and differences between the findings and other studies. Write about applicable recommendations for the University to be better based on Quantum theory.

4- It is mentioned in the last paragraph of the method.

5. Discussion part should be changed totally based on previous comment (part 4). Quality in Qualitative Research and Triangulation are not Discussion. Also 6 Themes should be written in Result.

5. This has changed completely.

6. Please write the manuscript based on qualitative study.

6- The manuscript was set based on qualitative studies.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript according to reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The article is accepted after this comment:
- There are some differences in writing some sentences or titles in Table 1., figure 1. and Part 4. "Creating the theory". Please write all these sections similarly.
Good Luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

1-It's a long introduction. The authors imported several definitions for each variable; for example, "quantum management". Please summarize the introduction

This introduction was briefly described.

2- English language needs editing.

It was coordinated with the Kowsar Company for editing

3- Why did you use the grounded theory method in the research?

Because in qualitative research, it is best to use the grounded theory method.

4- Please explain about the grounded theory method in the method section.

Additional explanations were made in this regard.

5- Please explain about the credibility of the grounded theory approach (explain 10 factor).

Additional explanations were made in this regard.

6- Please explain the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the samples.

Due to the nature of the present study, the samples included faculty members and managers of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences who were active in research and management ,and were selected from both sexes.

7- Where was the place of interview?

The interview was conducted in the offices of the managers and deputies of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences.

8- Did you used of any software for your analysis?

Nvivo software was used in this research.

9- Please explain more about three stages of analysis.

Further explanation was provided

10- The paragraph, the interviewees were four heads, seven deputies and eight directors who were interviewed from June 16 to October 7, 2019. Each interview also lasted 35 to 70 minutes,should be inserted after “The statistical population of the study included faculty members and managers of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences who actively participated in research and management” in line three.

Based on the mentioned format, it was modified and moved

11- The authors didn't explain about the results of the study in the result section.in reality, the items listed in the results section are part of the description of the method. Please do a fundamental review of the results.

An overview of the results was obtained

12- The authors didn't discuss in the discussion section and described some parts of method. Please do a fundamental review of the discussion.

The entire section of the article has been changed

13- In short, we don't have the result and discussion parts based on standards.

It was changed according to the standard.

14- There is not the conclusion section in the manuscript.

The conclusion was corrected

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 8 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
All changes are well done and the article is appropriate and suitable for publication in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 8 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
All changes are well done and the article is appropriate and suitable for publication in the journal.
Thanks.