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.95134
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 8(2); e95134

# Peer Review Report for "Comparing 10-Item and 60-Item Big Five Personality Inventories in Explaining the Depressive Symptoms in Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction"

**Author(s):** Mozhgan Saeidi, Keivan Kakabraee, Khodamorad Momeni

## Review Timeline:

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 10 Jun 2019 |
| Revised Date: | 6 Oct 2019 |
| Accepted Date: | 6 Oct 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) — 12 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The findings of this article are valuable. Nevertheless, some modifications should be made.
• In the title, please the word "big five" replaced by "five-factor".
• In the abstract, the number of men must be replaced by the percentage.
• Word "Personality inventory" can be added to the keywords list.
• In the tools section, a full name for DASS is required.
• In the results part must be mention to all correlations and p-values.
• Non-randomized sampling must be cited in the limitations part.
Best Wishes

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jun 2019

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) 15 Jun 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.

**DEAR EDITOR**

**Thanks for valuable comments in order to improve the manuscript. The reviewers comments are highlighted in red line.**

**Reviewers' Comments:**

*Reviewer 1:*
*Dear Editor*
*The findings of this article are valuable. Nevertheless, some modifications should be made.*
*• In title, please the word "big five" replaced by "five factor". WAS DONE*
*• In abstract, the number of men must be replaced by the percentage. WAS DONE*
*• Word "Personality inventory" can be added to the keywords list. WAS DONE*
*• In tools section, full name for DASS is required. WAS DONE*
*• In results part, must be mention to the all correlations and p-values. WAS DONE*
*• Non-randomized sampling must by cite in limitations part. WAS DONE*

***Best regards***

**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**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Oct 2019

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** (1) 5 Oct 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/PUBLISHER**

**Thanks for valuable comments in order to improve the manuscript. The reviewers' comments are highlighted in red line.**

**Reviewers' Comments:**

*The language edit was approved and the comments were answered.*

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**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Oct 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.