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 Medical Education
Article DOI: 10.5812/jme.106280
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 19(3); e106280

Peer Review Report for "Team-Based Learning in Medical Ethics Education: Evaluation and Preferences of Students in Oman"

Author(s): Miriam Simon

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 24 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 10 Nov 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) — 17 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Unfortunately, the manuscript is not structured well. It needs some major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 23 Aug 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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 23 Aug 2020

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Team Based Learning in Medical Ethics Education: Evaluation and Preferences of Students in Oman

Reply to Reviewers
Manuscript ID: 106280

Q: Problem statement is not quite clear, while it could have been better expressed
R: A clear and precise problem statement has been included in the revised manuscript

Q: Please specify the type of study
R: Research design and method of data collection has been included in section 2.1 (Research Design)

Q: Time of study, the participants ' attributes are not specified in the study. It is not clear when the period is offered.
R: These details are specified in section 2.2 (Participants)

Q: Please provide appropriate explanations for how students are allocated to groups
R: Random sampling method was used. Details included and highlighted in section 2.2 (Participants)

Q: Please show this information (Procedure) in a table
R: A figure illustrating the steps in the procedure has been included in the revised manuscript (Figure 1)

Q: Please show this information in the table There is no need to present in the way of method, it should be stated in the results.
R: This is the comment received for section 2.4 (study instrument). Only a short description of the study instrument is provided in this section. Details are included in the Results section.

Q: The type of statistical test that has been used is not known.
R: Descriptive statistical methods were utilized. Mentioned and highlighted in the revised manuscript

Q: This manuscript requires a better discussion here, where only the results are indicated that the discussion needs to be reviewed.
R: Separate section for Results (section 3) and discussion (section 4) have been included in the revision

Q: Demographic characteristics of the students have not been mentioned. The number of completed questionnaires was not stated.
R: Included in the first paragraph of the results section

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 Nov 2020

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