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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.97422
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(3); e97422

Peer Review Report for "Challenges and Motivational Facilitators of Social Accountability in Medical Students of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Mahbobeh Mohammadi, Mehdi Bagheri, Parivash Jafari, Leila Bazrafkan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Sep 2019
Revised Date:	6 May 2020
Accepted Date:	7 May 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 31 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 2 Jan 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.

Shiraz E medical journal

Editor in Chief

Date: 2020.01.19

Dear Editor

The manuscript was revised based on the dear reviewer's comments. The authors would appreciate it if you kindly consider our manuscript entitled "**How Medical students motivate for social accountability in medical school?**" for publication in Shiraz E medical journal

. The chance given to the authors to amend the manuscript is highly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

Response to Reviewers' Comments:

We are very grateful for your comments to our manuscript. We revised the manuscript in accordance with your advice, and carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical, and bibliographical errors.

Here below is point-by-point response to your comments.

Comment 1: *The text needs English edition.*

Response: With many thanks for your comment, we edited the text completely.

Comment 2: Please separate Rigor section from data analysis

Response: Thank you so much for your attention. We separate Rigor section from data analysis

Comment 3: *Ethics committee approval should be mentioned*.

Response: *Ethics committee approval mentioned* (5956)

Comment 4: In the result section, more quotations of the participants should be presented. You just interpreted the quotations. In the result section, applied definition should be mentioned for each concept. If you want to explain more about it, you should present more quotations of the participants.

Response: **based on your comment we correct the result section**

Comment 5: *Please complete the table of Theme and Sub-theme as follow:*

Meaning Unit Condensed Meaning Unit Subtheme Theme

Response: **based on your comment we correct the table**

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
- In the abstract, you should use Result instead of finding.
- In the result try to write the definition of the concept more briefly. Definitions are prescriptive rather than descriptive, If you want to define it extensively, you need to quote more.
- The conclusion is not written in accordance with the Result.
- In the implication section, write the recommendation in more detail.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Apr 2020

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 (2)

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.

To the editor of EMedical Journal

Date: 2020.May. 6

Dear Editor

The authors would be appreciating it that you kindly considered the submitted manuscript entitled "**Motivation for Social Accountability in Medical Students of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences: Facilitators and Challenges (A Qualitative Study)**

That would be our pleasure to be in touch with such a high quality journal if there are any problems with the text. We are looking forward hearing more comments from your journal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

The Corresponding Author

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

In the result try to write the definition of the concept more briefly. Definitions are perscriptive rather than descriptive , If you want to define it extensively, you need to quote more.
The conclusion is not written in accordance with the Result.
In the implication section, write the recommendation in more detail.

Comment 1: In In the result try to write the definition of the concept more briefly. Definitions are perscriptive rather than descriptive , If you want to define it extensively, you need to quote more.
The conclusion is not written in accordance with the Result.
In the implication section, write the recommendation in more detail.

Response: With many thanks for your comment, we've done all the modifications you desire.

Acknowledgement:

This article is the result of the research project and extracted from Thesis Mrs, mahbobehMohammadi With the 5965 Code. We acknowledge the medical teacher, students and education development center, faculty members, and others participants who helped us to perform this study.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 May 2020

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