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

Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/jcrps.90762
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 8(2); e90762

Peer Review Report for "The Role and Status of Philosophy in Nursing Knowledge, Insight and Competence"

Author(s): Fatemeh Cheraghi, Mohammad Reza Yousefzadeh, Afshin Goodarzi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 24 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 27 Aug 2019

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) — 13 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Plagiarism not detected in the manuscript.
- Analysis method of the manuscript is suitable.
- Results are suitable.
- Referencing and citations are Correct.
- English writing is Correct.

my decision about this manuscript is revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 May 2019

Dear AE,
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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 May 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 May 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 May 2019

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.

1) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)? No results for philosophy and nursing education in Main Heading Terms, No results for philosophy in nursing in Main Heading Terms, No results for philosophical thinking in Main Heading Terms, No results for clinical thinking in Main Heading Terms, No results for philosophical attitude in nursing in Main Heading Terms, Only the word philosophy has been defined

Reply from the author of the article: Keywords corrected according to the mesh Contains:

Keywords: Philosophy, Nursing Philosophy, nursing knowledge, attitude, competence

2) Study Design Described Sufficiently? Please explain the method further

Reply from the author of the article: The criteria for entry and exit criteria are explained

The Inclusion criteria in this study include:

1- Studies conducted on the role of nursing philosophy which is done by Systematic review, Review studies, Descriptive-cross sectional and qualitative studies

2- Studies related to the role of philosophy in nursing knowledge

3- Studies related to the role of philosophy in nursing attitudes

4- Studies related to the role of philosophy in nursing competence

The Exclusion criteria include:

1. Letter to the editor in chief

2. Repetitive studies

3. Philosophical studies related to other jobs

3- Limitations to study?

Reply from the author of the article:

Limitations of the study

1. Lack of access to the full text of some studies which was not controlled by the researcher

2. Limited number of studies on the role of philosophy in nursing

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 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 13 Jul 2019

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 (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.

Dear Editor

Thanks for your valuable feedback; the necessary changes have been highlighted in yellow

Thank you, Dr. Yousefzadeh

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.