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.111566
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 20(1); e111566

Peer Review Report for "Analysis of the Orthodontic Exams in Department of Orthodontics of Shahid Beheshti Dental School"

Author(s): Kazem Dalaei, Ali Khorsand Nobahar, Mohammad Behnaz, Mahtab Nouri, Fahimeh Anbari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 26 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 24 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Somaye Bosak: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Hello. Thanks for this valuable study, the authors should edit and explain about comments mentioned below:
1. Add “analysis” to your keywords
2. Please in the method part, more explain about “how you assess content validity and taxonomy of question” like as your methodology, tools and etc. this part is unclear
3. Please in the method part explain your validity and reliability of your method or tools
Thank you

Masomeh kalantarion: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
- References in the text should be in parentheses.
In the abstract section
- “Orthodontic exam” is not a MeSH term. It is better to use one more MesH-indexed term for better retrieval of the article.
In the introduction section

- There is no definition of descriptive exam

In the Method section

- How descriptive questions are analyzed
- Why was the study time 6 years ago?

In the results section

- The results of the analysis of descriptive questions are not mentioned

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Jan 2021

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) 11 Jan 2021

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 reviewers,

Thank you for your valuable comments.

Here is our responses and revised version of our manuscript.

Reviewer 1:
1-References in the text should be in parentheses.

It was corrected in the whole manuscript.

2-In the abstract section"Orthodontic exam" is not a MeSH term. It is better to use one more MesH-indexed term for better retrieval of the article.

Key words have been revised according to Mesh terms.

3-In the introduction section.There is no definition of descriptive exam

It was added and highlighted

4-In the Method section.How descriptive questions are analyzed

As it is mentioned in the method section the study was conducted on four-choice questions of the exams.

The sentence is highlighted.

5-Why was the study time 6 years ago?

The analysis was performed on the exams just before the dentistry curriculum reform. So, in the next phase it can be compared to the exam analyses after curriculum reform.

6-In the results section.The results of the analysis of descriptive questions are not mentioned

Since the majority of questions were multiple choice, descriptive questions were not analyzed from the coefficient of discrimination and difficulty index point of view, they were only assessed as mentioned in table 1

Reviewer 2:
1. Add "analysis" to your keywords

It was added to the keywords
2. please in method part, more explain about "how you assess content validity and taxonomy of question" like as your methodology, tools and etc. this part is unclear
3. please in method part explain about your validity and reliability your method or tools

2,3-Explanations about validity and reliability of the methods are added and highlighted in the method 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)** 24 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
According to the opinions of the editorial board, the revised article was accepted for publication in the journal.
Best regards