Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 23 · Issue 11 · e121136

OPEN PEER REVIEW

A Comparative Study of Students' Academic Optimism and Hope, and Their Relationships with Academic Achievement

Ali Asghar Hayat, Nafise Emad, Negar Sharafi, Mohammad Hasan Keshavarzi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Dec 2021	30 Jul 2022	4 Sep 2022	10.5812/semj-121136

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 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 Referee 1, Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors,
Please check the following details:
1- In the abstract, the method section did not have cohesion.

The method was corrected.
2- In the abstract, it would be better to write the exact p-value.

Based on journal standard, we should wrote at p 0.05 0r 0.01
3- In the introduction, please write more about the purpose of the study: done
4- In the methods, you wrote that this study was a cross-sectional study, but you did not write the study period. Done
5- How did you collect 350 participants? Based on which sampling methods? Explained in method
6- In the method, you did not mention the statistical tests. Done
7- Which statistical software did you use? We added in method section
8- At the beginning of the results, you should write the sample size. Done
9- Tables 1 and 2 need to explain more. We explained our table
10- Reporting table 4 was not vividly.
11- Reporting the results was not clear and precise.

Some changes were made to the results report, however the report was based on the journal standard
12- All references were old; you should use current references. Some older articles have been used because they relate to theories that related to research variables, however new *references added to the article*
Reviewer 2:
- The content is the same in the background and the conclusion. With this description, there does not seem to be any need to do this research. Changes were applied both in the introduction and in the conclusion
- The method of sampling and access to students is not mentioned in the abstract: Done
- The manuscript need to grammatical check: Done
- For what basis and what formula were 350 students selected and how was the sampling method? Explained in method
- The discussion part of the study is fragile. The discussion is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the relationship between hope, optimism, and academic achievement as an introduction. The second part again describes the results and personal interpretation of the authors as results and does not compare and interpret with other studies. In conclusion, the results of the research were compared with other researches and the interpretations of the results were explained
- All references are very old and unreliable. Some older articles have been used because they relate to theories that related to research variables, however new *references added to the article*

Reviewer 3:
PLEASE Increase the number of keywords: Done
The sampling method should be mentioned.: Done
The method of calculating the sample size or the reason for selecting this volume of samples should be mentioned. Done
The time of sentences must be changed to a simple: The manuscript has been edited by an English-speaking native

The limitations of research, suggestions, and recommendations of future studies discussed should be mentioned at the end of the discussion. Done

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 1 Jul 2022 – 9 Jul 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 1 Jul 2022

Dear Authors,
Please check the following details:
• It is not necessary to put references in the abstract.
• In the abstract, please explain more about the procedure of your study.
• In the method section, please list the variables in Cochran's sampling formula.
• It would be better to use "methods" instead of materials.
• Please explain more about the procedure of your study in the methods section.
• In the abstract, it was written "r = -0.15", but in table 3, you have written "r = 0.15".
• In table 3, please specify which variables you examined for correlation.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 9 Jul 2022

Minor Revision

3

Revision 2

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.

Reviewer 1: *It is not necessary to put references in the abstract.*	Was done
In the abstract, please explain more about the procedure of your study.	Was done
In the method section, please write the variables of Cochran's sampling formula	Was done
It would be better to write the "methods" instead of the materials.	Was done
• Please explain more about the procedure of your study in the methods section.	Was done
In the abstract, it was written "r = -0.15", but in table 3, you have written "r = 0.15".	Was done
In table 3, please specify the correlation between which variables you did.	Was done
Please check the grammar in all parts of your manuscript. There are errors in the title and other parts of the manuscript	Was done

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 30 Aug 2022 – 30 Aug 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 30 Aug 2022

Thank you very much for your responses.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 30 Aug 2022

Thank you.