Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 23 · Issue 1 · e115087

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Scientific Paper Production by Iranian Dental Schools Between 2015 and 2019

Heshmatollah Heidari, Aira Sabokseir, Seyyed Taghi Heydari, Mehrdad Vossoughi, Ali Golkari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Apr 2021	23 May 2021	22 Jun 2021	10.5812/semj.115087

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, parsa firoozi, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

3 comments · 5 May 2021 – 15 May 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 5 May 2021

Title:
There are similar titles that are searchable in the literature. It may draw more attention if the authors use titles such as: Dental research performance of Iranian dental schools between 2015 and 2019, or something similar.
Abstract:
1. Keywords should be revised. Please find MESH terms. The main key points include terms such as article or scientific paper.
2. Line 26. Why do the authors use “better” in the abstract conclusion? The conclusion, especially line 28, is more advice than a conclusion. It would be better to rewrite this section according to the findings of the research.

Methods:
1. Please explain whether the method of evaluation was developed by the researchers or has any references.
2. Line 81. It would be more useful if the authors mentioned the metrics of Iranian papers in the evaluated databases. For example, the impact factor or H index of the published Iranian papers and their lower and upper limits. This additional information may facilitate better assessment.
Results:
Lines 115. Quantitative value, not qualitative? Please correct this part.
Line 120. How did the authors obtain this result?
Tables 2 and 3. Please explain the numbers in parentheses and brackets in the first row of the tables.
Discussion:
Due to a new trend to publish joint works (collaboration between universities) in some journals, the authors may consider and discuss this issue.
Authors should mention their limitations and advice at the end of the manuscript.
Conclusion:
It would be better to delete the text from Line 212 to the end of the paragraph from this part and add it to the end of the discussion.

parsa firoozi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 13 May 2021

1. The topic is acceptable and reflects the content appropriately.
2. Too many grammatical errors were found. Please recheck your paper with the help of an expert in this regard. Also, it is recommended that you check your paper with the GRAMMARLY application (the premium version is available from some Iranian service providers). (Most important issue)
3. Keywords are too general and should be more specific. For example, the term "Schools" refers to high schools and elementary schools as well as dental schools. Kindly check your keywords with the MeSH database.
4. The Introduction should be more mature. It does not seem to be enough. Explain more about the problem and the things we do not know and the possible benefits of this work.
5. In the Discussion section, you have not mentioned your limitations. It is recommended that you mention your work's limitations and strengths.

6. In the Conclusion section, the sentence "The quality of produced papers is another very important matter to study" is not relevant to your aim and results.
7. Explain more about the benefits and future applications of this work.
8. Finally, revise your paper again with scrutiny and make it more fluent.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2021

Suggestions for improving this manuscript are provided below:
English writing should be revised; also, there are some typos and syntax errors.
Abstract:
It would be better to select the keywords (3-10) from MESH.
Introduction:
It is better to use the word "Web Of Science (WOS)" instead of "International Scientific Indexing (ISI" as a database.
Methods:
How were articles co-published (jointly) by universities considered?
Results:
Line 106: Shiraz (N=1010)
Line 115: Change qualitative to quantitative.
Discussion
Discuss limitations of the study.
The conclusion needs some revision.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear E-Medical Editors:

Your website says that I should prepare my responses to each reviewer in a separate word file. However, your system allows me to just upload one file!!!

So I had to merge all files here in one file. Hope it is ok.

Response to reviewer 1

Dear Sir/Madam

The authors would like to thank you very much for your encouraging comment.

Response to reviewer 2

Dear Sir/Madam

The authors would like to thank you for your constructive comments.

I can confirm that all comments are taken into action. A revised version is now uploaded and a point by point response to your comments is given below:

Q: Title:
There are similar titles that are searchable in the literature. It may draw more attention if the authors use titles such as: Dental research performance of Iranian dental schools between 2015 and 2019, or something similar.

R: We agree with your point. However, as nowadays more readers try to find articles by search engines, the authors prefer to keep the title that is close to the title of similar articles. This way, we hope that it would come up more frequently by the main search engines. Having that in mind, we would be happy to change it if the editors see it necessary.

Abstract:

1. Q: Keywords are should be revised. Please find MESH terms. The main key points such as article or scientific paper.
   R: There is a problem with the journal system in managing the keywords. The proper way is to separate the keywords by a semicolon (;) and not by a comma. This is because some MESH terms have comma inside them. The term we have used is "schools, dental" as it appears in MESH main headings. To correct that, we have now used a substitute keyword "Dental schools" as it appears in MESH entry terms.
2. Q: Line 26. Why the authors use “better” In abstract conclusion. The conclusion especially line 28 is more an advice than conclusion. This section is better to rewritten according to findings of the research.
   R: The conclusion in abstract is now revised. Thank you for your comment. The authors however, would prefer to keep the last sentence. It is an usual practice to put the main comment/advice at the end of the abstract, because, there is no "discussion" part in abstract.

Methods:

1. Please explain if the method of evaluation is researcher-construct or it has any references.

   R: It is now included. Thank you.

2. Line 81. It was more useful if the authors mentioned the metrics of Iranian papers in the evaluated databases. For example, the impact factor, or H index of the Iranian published papers, and their lower and upper limits. This additional information may facilitate better assessment.

   R: H-index belongs to authors and impact factor belongs to journals. You agree that they were not relevant to the objectives of this study as we studied articles. However, a paragraph is now added to the end of the discussion section to explain why the number of citations to each article was not presented in this paper.

Results:

Q: Lines 115: Quantitive value not qualitive? Please correct this part.

R: It is rephrased to "quantitative value". Thanks.

Q: Line 120: How the authors gained to this result.

R: The quantitative value of less than 10 in 5 years: less than 2 in each year. The sentence is now reworded to be clear.

Q; Tables 2 and 3: Please explain the description of numbers in parenthesis and brackets at the first row of table.

R: The descriptions are given in the title instead; because they were too long and would not fit inside the first row. We hope you accept this as a limitation.

Discussion:

Q: Due to a new trend to publish joint works (collaboration between universities) in some journals, the authors may consider and discuss this issue. Authors should mention their limitations and advices at the end of the manuscript.

R: Done now. Thanks.

Conclusion:

Q: Line 212 to the end of paragraph, are better to delete from this part and add to the end of discussion.

R: It is done. Thanks.

Response to reviewer 3

Dear Sir/Madam

The authors would like to thank you for your constructive comments.

I can confirm that all comments are taken into action. A revised version is now uploaded and a point by point response to your comments is given below:

Reviewer 3:

1. Topic is acceptable and reflects the content appropriately.
   R: Thanks.
2. Too many grammatical errors were found. Please re-check your paper with help of an expert in this regard. Also, it is recommended to check your paper with the GRAMMARLY application (premium version is available from some Iranian service providers. (Most important issue)
   R: It is now done with the help of a native English speaking dentist. Thanks.
3. Keywords are too general and should be more specified. for example, the term "Schools" refers to high schools and elementary schools as well as dental schools. kindly check your keywords with the MeSH database.
   R: There is a problem with the journal system in managing the keywords. The proper way is to separate the keywords by a semicolon (;) and not by a comma. This is because some MESH terms have a comma inside them. The term we have used is "schools, dental" as it appears in MESH main headings. To correct that, we have now used a substitute keyword "Dental schools" as it appears in MESH entry terms.
4. Introduction should be more mature. It does not seem to be enough. Explain more about the problem and the things we do not know and the possible benefits of this work.
   R: You are right. There were more on this issue in the first draft. However, some paragraphs were deleted based on word count limitations.
5. In the Discussion section you have not mentioned your limitations. It is recommended to mention your works' limitations and strengths.
   R: It is done now. Thanks.
6. In the Conclusion section the sentence entitled "The quality of produced papers is another very important matter to study" is not relevant to your aim and results.
   R: It is done now. Thanks.
7. Explain more about the benefits and future applications of this work.
   R: It is done now. Thanks.

8. Finally, revise your paper again with scrutiny and make it more fluent.

R: It is revised now. Thanks.

Response to associate editors comments

Dear Sir/Madam

The authors would like to thank both the editors and the reviewers for their constructive comments.

I can confirm that all comments are taken into action. A revised version is now uploaded and a point by point response to your comments is given below:

Q: English writing should be revised; Also, There are some typo mistakes and syntax errors.

R: The manuscript is now checked and corrected by a native English speaking dentist.

Abstract:

Q: Keywords: Keywords (3-10) better to be selected from MESH.

R: The keywords were all selected from MESH. There is a problem with the journal system in managing the keywords. The proper way is to separate the keywords by a semicolon (;) and not by a comma. This is because some MESH terms have comma inside them. The term we have used is "schools, dental" as it appears in MESH main headings. To correct that, we have now used a substitute keyword "Dental schools" as it appears in MESH entry terms.

Q: t is better to use the word "Web Of Science (WOS)" instead of "International Scientific Indexing (ISI" as a database.

R: It is done now. Thanks.

Methods:

Q: How were articles co-published (joint) between universities considered?

R: The novel "quantitative value" variable introduced by authors in this paper was made especially for this matter. In this variable each school gets its own share of an article. It was explained in lines 82-88 and in 192-199. (the line numbers are from the first version and may vary in the revised version).

Results:

Q: Line 106: Line 106: Shiraz(N=1010). R: Corrected. Thanks
Line 115: qualitative change to quantitative R: Corrected. Thanks.

Discussion:

Q: Discuss limitations of the study.

R: Some limitations are now added to the end of discussion. Thanks.

Conclusion:

Q: The conclusion needs some revision.

R: The conclusion is now revised. Thanks.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 22 Jun 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 22 Jun 2021

Accept