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.113404
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 20(1); e113404

Peer Review Report for "Study of Master's Dissertations in Medical Education in the Virtual Faculty of Medical Education and Management of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences in the Years 2011 to 2016"

Author(s): Ainaz Sourati, Somayeh Akbari Farmad, AmirMohammad AziziKolachahi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Feb 2021
Revised Date:	11 Apr 2021
Accepted Date:	10 May 2021

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)

28 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors of the article for choosing an interesting topic. The results of this article and its analysis can be effective in policy-making, setting research priorities in education and targeting student dissertations. But the points I make are to improve and enhance this article and should be considered by the authors.
Please

- Review the structure of the article based on the authors' guide file provided on the journal site
- Review the entire text in terms of translation, grammar, spelling and use of dots, commas, parentheses, etc.
- Use a single term for the thesis throughout the text and title, preferably MESH-based (Dissertation or Thesis)
- Notice to Uppercase and Lowercase in words.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors of the article for choosing an interesting topic. The results of this article and its analysis can be effective in policy making, setting research priorities in education and targeting student dissertations. But the points I make are to improve and enhance this article.
Please the authors:

- Review the structure of the article based on the authors' guide file provided on the journal site
- Review the entire text in terms of translation, grammar, spelling and use of dots, commas, parentheses, etc.
- Use a single term for the thesis throughout the text and title, preferably MESH-based (Dissertation or Thesis)
- Notice to Uppercase and Lowercase in words.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Mar 2021

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.

Thank you...all of comments were edited.

Whole of text:

Please

- Review the structure of the article based on the authors' guide file provided on the journal site **Objectives section added and a brief title written for table.**
- Review the entire text in terms of translation, grammar, spelling and use of dots, commas, parentheses, etc. **It was edited and highlighted.**
- Use a single term for the thesis throughout the text and title, preferably MESH-based (Dissertation or Thesis) **used of MESH and dissertation used in whole of the text.**
- Notice to **Uppercase** and **Lowercase** in words. **It was edited and i.e.publications turned to i.e.Publications that highlighted.**

Title:

- You used the word **evaluation** in the title, while there is no trace of evaluation in the article. Evaluation requires judgment about quality, in this study an assessment was conducted. **It was edited and evaluation turned to study.**

Abstract:

- The abstract is very long and can be adjusted to a maximum of 350 words. Especially in the method section, there is no need to mention categories. **It was edited and abstract shortened to 292 words.**
- Write keywords using MESH. **It was edited and dissertation turned to academic dissertation.**

Main Text:

- **Introduction:**
  - Since your study is retrospective, write the verbs in the last paragraph according to the time of the study. **It was edited and is turned to was and highlighted.**
- **Method:**

- The description provided for category 4 does not seem to match its name. Please review and write a clearer description or match the category name with its content. **It was edited and between criteria added.**

- In both categories 4 and 6 are **communication-based** articles included? Identify the difference between the two classes. **In category 4 is between criteria but in categort 6 is between teacher and student .**
  - The paragraphs related to the keywords used in the dissertations need to be reviewed and written errors corrected. **It was edited and – turned to , and highlighted.**
  - In sentence of "Types of study including "descriptive", "**research**", "needs assessment", "review", "evaluation",...." What is the meaning of **research** in this sentence?)Descriptive , ... are types of research(.**It was original research that was edited and highlighted.**
- In the **Tools section**, indicate what you mean by the tools used in the dissertations. **It was edited.(such as questionnaires, checklist, interview, and test)**
  - Does capability mean the same as competence? **If YES**, correct. **It was mean ability that corrected and highlighted.**
- **Result:**
- The names chosen for the types of studies in the text and diagram should be the same. (educational research/ educational scholarship) **It was edited and educational research selected.**
  - Some of the results related to keywords are given in the discussion section. Please include these in the results section. **It was edited and deleted from discussion section.**
  - The number of charts is large. Integrate the last two charts. **It was edited and integrated the last two charts.**
- **Discussion:**
  - There is no need to repeat the method and results in the discussion section. **It was edited and deleted from discussion section.**
  - In the discussion section: "**This finding is consistent with previous studies**". Which studies? **It was edited and previous studies added that highlighted.**

- For all findings, it is best to use other studies to support your findings and enrich discussion. At least mention studies and experiences at other universities. **It was edited and other studies added that highlighted**
- Correct last paragraph. **It was edited and highlighted.**
- Add research limitation and ethical issues. **All of dissertions had no name and free access.**

- **References:**
  - The number of references is limited. If you enrich the discussion, the references will also increase. **It was edited and now we have more references.**

Thank you

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 May 2021

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