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.110810
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 19(4); e110810

Peer Review Report for "Factors Influencing Implementation of Nursing Process by Nursing Students: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Tahere Moghadas, Maryam Sedaghati Kesbakhi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 9 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Dec 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) 25 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The subject of the study is noteworthy and important, but the paper needs a major review. The following suggestions are for improving the quality of the paper, and increasing its chances of being accepted in this journal.
Abstract:
- Methods and tools of data collection (semi-structured interview, individual/focus group), and chosen approach for content analysis (Graneheim and Lundman method), inclusion, and exclusion criteria need to be mentioned in the abstract.
Background: In qualitative research, the author must have sufficient experience in the field of research, so he/she must provide a brief description of his/her background and experience in that field, while you as the author have not provided any information about your own experiences and those of other writers in this field.
- In the background, mentioning the contradictory results of studies on the advantages and disadvantages of the nursing process is not in line with justifying the aim of your study: “the factors influencing the implementation of this process”, and misleads the readers. You need to provide evidence of improper implementation of this important process and then emphasize the need to identify the factors influencing its implementation.
- Methods: It is recommended to briefly explain your selected content analysis approach,

and describe the context of the study, and of undergraduate nursing education in Iran, and the characteristics of the participants, to increase the transferability of your study results. Also, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and whether the interview was conducted individually or in a focus group, and whether the data was collected through a tape recorder or through note-taking, were not mentioned.
- In designing interview questions, the questions should be designed in such a way that the participant is indirectly and purposefully conducted to the subject of the study, while your first question is exactly the title of the study. Of course, this issue cannot be corrected at the moment. In addition, data saturation is not discussed.
- Regarding the rigor of the study, no appropriate action has been taken to increase the transferability of results and data neutrality.
- Discussion: The discussion section lacks proper structure. The resulting themes need to be discussed and justified or confirmed along with the results of other similar studies. It was better to present the positive and negative influencing factors obtained through the research separately, and then the studies that confirm or reject these results were discussed.
- There are also many grammatical and writing problems in the text, especially in the discussion and conclusion section, which need to be rewritten and corrected.
The paper after major revision could be accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Nov 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) 25 Nov 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.

Dear Editor Journal of Medical Education

Thank you for this opportunity to improve our manuscript with this title" Factors Influencing Implementation of Nursing Process by nursing students: A Qualitative Study" number **11080** All reviewers' comments were answered one by one and underlined in the text of the manuscript.

Best Regards

Research Team

Reviewer #1

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The points mentioned in the abstract were corrected.

Answer: In the background section, a summary of the authors' experiences on the subject of research was provided.

Answer: In the background section, evidence of improper implementation of nursing process

was underlined.

Answer: The points mentioned in the abstract were revised. Regarding the rigor of the study, transferability in the text was underlined.

Answer: The discussion part was revised.

Answer: The grammatical and writing problems in the text was corrected.

.

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)** 19 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
considering based on the editorial board's opinion, The article is accepted. But there are two questions in the text that should be answered in the final version.
Thanks.