Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 11 · Issue 2 · e133935

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Designing a Stress Management Model in Forensic Medicine Organization Using Grounded Theory Approach

Hossein Shahnavazi, Aliakbar Farhangi, Mehrdad Godarzvand Chegini

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
30 Nov 2022	12 Dec 2022	20 Dec 2022	10.5812/jcrps-133935

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** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

2 comments · 12 Dec 2022 – 12 Dec 2022

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 12 Dec 2022

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 12 Dec 2022

Minor Revision

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.

Reviewer	Comments of Reviewers	Answer to Comment	Location in main text
Reviewer 1	In Abstract 1. It seems that the keywords are not included in the mesh. Be sure to check. In Introduction.	It was revised based on MeSH.	Page: 1 Line: 27
Reviewer 1	2. The objective(s) and cause(s) of the case presentation should more clearly state. Its necessity has not been determined.	It was highlighted.	Page: 2 Line: 33-36 Page: 3 Line: 39-40
Reviewer 1	In Materials and methods. 3. What is the reason for using grounded theory?	It was highlighted.	Page: 4 Line: 2-3
Reviewer 1	In Results 4. Tables of this paper is not based on author guide and journal style	It was revised based on published papers of journal.	Page: 5, Table: 1 Page: 5, Table: 2 Page: 6, Table: 3 Page: 7, Table: 4
Reviewer 1	In Discussion 5. Some research findings have been repeated, which is unnecessary. It is recommended to delete these parts. 6. It is necessary to mention the limitations of the study.	It was revised. Three lines were deleted from the previous version.	Page: 8 Discussion
Reviewer 1	In Conclusion 7. The volume of the conclusion section seems to be too much. Authors can provide a shorter conclusion if they wish.	It was revised. Three lines were deleted from the previous version.	Page: 9 Conclusion
Reviewer 1	In References 8. Some of the references are old and mostly are not in the style of journal.	It was revised and highlighted.	Page: 10 References
Reviewer 1	In Structure 9. In different parts of the text of the article, you have used the word "forensic" and in some places, like the caption of the third picture, "legal". It is necessary to create the uniformity of the main vocabulary.	It was revised and highlighted.	Page: 8 Line: 2
Reviewer 2	1. In the “Introduction”, the need for this research should be highlighted.	It was highlighted.	Page: 2 Line: 33-36
Reviewer 2	2. The word count of the “Introduction” is very high.	It was revised. Three lines were deleted from the previous version.	Page: 3 End of “Introduction”
Reviewer 2	3. Mention the Ethical considerations in “Methods” section.	According to the guidelines of the journal, the ethics code is entered in a separate box, in time of online submission. the article is submitted (independent of the text of the article), which is apparently not visible to the respected reviewers.	----
Reviewer 2	4. Unnecessary items are written in “Methods” section, which can be deleted.	Please indicate the specific item.	----

	These items have increased the volume of this section.		
Reviewer 2	*5. Tables of this paper is not based on author guide and journal style.*	**It was revised and highlighted.**	**Page: 5, Table: 1** **Page: 5, Table: 2** **Page: 6, Table: 3** **Page: 7, Table: 4**
Reviewer 2	*6. Also at the beginning of the discussion section, unnecessary items are written, which can be deleted.*	**It was revised.** **Three lines were deleted from the previous version.**	**Page: 8** **Discussion**
Reviewer 2	*7. The "Discussion" has not been made reasonable. Comparison with similar papers and studies is weak.*	**It was revised and highlighted.**	**Page: 8** **Discussion**
Reviewer 2	*8. Author(s) should add more up to date references to the study.*	**It was revised and highlighted.**	**Page: 10** **References**
Reviewer 2	*9. The references are completely unorganized and unstructured.*	**It was revised and highlighted.**	**Page: 10** **References**

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 20 Dec 2022 – 20 Dec 2022

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 20 Dec 2022

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 20 Dec 2022

Accept