Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 12 · Issue 1 · e135312

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Effectiveness of Educational Program Based on Academic Engagement Derived from the Model on Students' Academic Satisfaction

Masoumeh Babajani, Nasrolah Erfani, Yahya Yarahamdi, Hamzeh Ahmadian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Jan 2023	25 Feb 2023	28 Feb 2023	10.5812/jcrps-135312

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 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Feb 2023 – 25 Feb 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2023

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2023

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 code	Comment of Reviewer	Our Answer
1	1. The volume of the “method” part seems large, if possible it can be reduced.	According to the authors, there is no additional material written in the method section, if the respected referee does not have such an opinion, he can mention its specific case.
1	2. The word “health” is not needed in the title, because the training provided was not related to health.	Revised and highlighted.
1	3. In the method section, it is mentioned to approve the content of educational programs by experts, but it is not clear in what format? By how many experts? And with what specialties?	Revised and highlighted.
1	4. Is it necessary to provide two columns titled degree of freedom in Table 4, in Results?	Yes, according to the opinion of the statistician of this research.
1	5. It seems that some more up-to-date and reliable sources can be added to the discussion section.	Revised and highlighted.
1	6. It seems possible to make the conclusion part more concise.	Revised and highlighted.
2	1. It seems that the "keywords" are not mesh-matched, when this is a necessity.	Keywords revised and highlighted based on title and MeSh.
2	2. Is it necessary to present the entire content of the training sessions in the form of a bulky table 1 in "methods"?	If these things are not written, the writers will have a challenge in understanding the material.
2	3. The issues related to ethics are not mentioned in the research in "methods". Has the academic ethics committee approved these items?	According to the rules of the journal, the code of ethics is entered in a separate box, when the article is submitted (independent of the text of the article), which is apparently not visible to the respected reviewers.
2	4. In the "results", GPA extended mode should be written.	Revised and highlighted.
2	5. Does the number of tables comply with the journal policy? Can some tables be merged in "Results"?	The tables correspond to different subjects and cannot be merged.
2	6. Does this number of research limitations affect the generalizability of its results?	The mentioned limitations do not significantly affect the results and their generalizability.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 28 Feb 2023 – 28 Feb 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 28 Feb 2023

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 28 Feb 2023

Accept