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

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.110755
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 10(6); e110755

# Peer Review Report for "Attitudes of the Third-Year Clinical Anesthesiology Residents Toward an Independent Clinical Practice Rotation in COVID-19 Pandemic in Iran"

**Author(s):** Ali Dabbagh, Seyyedeh Narjes Ahmadizadeh, Sogol Asgari, Kamal Fani, Nilofar Massoudi, Mohammadreza Moshari, Parissa Sezari, Sedigheh Shokrollahi, Soodeh Tabashi, Ardeshir Tajbakhsh, Maryam Vosoughian

**Review Timeline:**

- Submit Date: 2 Nov 2020
- Revised Date: 7 Dec 2020
- Accepted Date: 7 Dec 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**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The subject of the article was good, but some points you must work on:
1- Were the residents at the same level in terms of quality of practice, ability to make rational decisions, performance under pressure, and stress management in critical situations?
2- Did the residents have access to anyone to consult with when faced with challenges in the decision-making process?
3- Was the study on the residents conducted at one hospital or different hospitals with the same equipment and resources during the same period of time. It is important because of assurance.
4- What was the guideline used for measuring stress score?
5- It would have been better if a sample of self-administered questionnaire was used in the article.
6- It was better if research is done in a larger group of residents for best, reasonable, and

extensile results.
With best regards.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- How the study size was arrived at?
2- Explain how variables were handled in the analyses .
3- Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported.
4- The result was very short please say about key result.
5- Discuss the external validity of the study result.
Thanks.

**Behrooz Zaman**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 5 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the researchers for their very useful work. I think the followings are helpful for better understanding the article:
- Please include the 29 item questionnaire and the Likert scale of scoring the answers in the method section.
- In the results section, it is written that the factors have been modified to six ones, but Table 2 contains 7 factors. Please correct it.
- If there is a specific conclusion or point about question 30 which is open-ended, please mention it.
Sincerely,

**Behrooz Zaman**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Dec 2020

Dear EIC
Thanks to the authors of the article, the comments of three reviewers will be sent to you.
With respect,

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me. I read with interest this article which has been in the field of education. The global structure and writing were logical. My comments are about the References section:
- Ref 2 and 8 are similar
- Ref 9 is unacceptable
- Consider and add below six refs:
1) Pergolizzi Jr. JV, Magnusson P, LeQuang JA, Breve F, Paladini A, et al. The Current Clinically Relevant Findings on COVID-19 Pandemic. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(2):e103819
2) Mahmoodpoor A, Shadvar K, Ghamari AA, Mohammadzadeh Lameh M, Asghari Ardebili R, et al. Management of Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19: What We Learned and What We Do. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(3):e104900.

3) Ali H, Ismail AA, Abdalwahab A . Mental Stress in Anesthesia and Intensive Care Physicians During COVID-19 Outbreak. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(5):e106623.
4) Dabbagh A, Abtahi D, Aghamohammadi H, Ahmadizadeh SN, Ardehali SH, et al. Relationship Between “Simulated Patient Scenarios and Role-Playing” Method and OSCE Performance in Senior Anesthesiology Residents: A Correlation Assessment Study, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(5):e106640.
5) Dabbagh A, Sezari P, Tabashi S, Tajbakhsh A, Massoudi N, et al. Attitudes of Anesthesiology Residents Toward a Small Group Blended Learning Class, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(3):e103148.
6) Dabbagh A, Elyassi H, Sabouri AS, Vahidshahi K, Ziaee SAM, et al. The Role of Integrative Educational Intervention Package (Monthly ITE, Mentoring, Mocked OSCE) in Improving Successfulness for Anesthesiology Residents in the National Board Exam, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(2):e98566.
Regards

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
This submitted manuscript can be considered for publishing after minor revision
Sincerely

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 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 (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 Professor Imani

Editor in Chief

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine

Thank you for considering our manuscript for review in the journal titled: "**Attitudes of 3rd-year clinical anesthesiology residents towards an independent clinical practice rotation in COVID-19 pandemic in Iran**". We appreciate the great comments by *Esteemed Reviewers*. We have used the comments to revise the manuscript. Kindly please see the response to each comment here.

Sincerely Yours

Corresponding Author

| Reviewer 1: | | |
|---|---|---|
| Reviewer comment | Author Response | The response is addressed in….?? |
| 1-How the study size was arrived at? | Thank you for this important comment.<br>Since the total target population was less than 20, we used a consensus method. All 3rd-year clinical anesthesiology residents were included. | 3rd paragraph of methods |
| 2-Explain how variables were handled | Thank you. This is a very great comment. | 5th paragraph of methods |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| in the analyses. | | |
| 3-Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | Thank you very much for this important comment. The scientific explanation was added to the last lines of the Introduction. | the last lines of the Introduction. |
| 4- Result was very short please say about the key result | Thank you very much. The results were extended as you have recommended; as mean±standard deviation for each question in Table-1 and Figure 1 and Table 2 | Table-1 and Figure 1 and Table 2 |
| 5- discuss the external validity of the study result | Thank you for this wise and interesting comment.<br>It was better if the research was done in a larger group of residents for best, reasonable, and extensile results. This was one of the study limitations which is mentioned at the end of the discussion as a limitation | At the end of the discussion under the title "study limitations" |
| Reviewer 2: | | |
| 1-Were the residents at the same level in terms of quality of practice, ability to make rational decisions, performance under pressure and stress management in critical situations? | Thank you for this wise and interesting comment.<br>This was one of the study limitations which is mentioned at the end of the discussion as a limitation | At the end of the discussion under the title "study limitations" |
| 2-Did the residents have access to anyone to consult with, when faced with challenges in the decision making process? | Thank you for this comment.<br>Yes. They had affiliated attending available for telephone consult and support. | At the end of the METHODS. |
| 3- Was the study on the residents conducted at the one hospital or different hospitals with same | Thank you for this comment.<br>The study was the result of a one-month rotation in SBMU; however, in different hospitals which had similar organization and similar | At the end of the METHODS. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| equipment and resources during same period of time. It is important because of assurance. | settings. | |
| 4- What was the guideline used for measuring stress score? | Thank you for this wise and interesting comment.<br>This was one of the study limitations which is mentioned at the end of the discussion as a limitation | At the end of the discussion under the title "study limitations" |
| 5-It would have been better if a sample of self-administered questionnaire was used in the article. | This is a great and completely correct comment. We added the translated questionnaire as Table3 of the study | Table 3 |
| 6- It was better if research done in larger group of residents for best, reasonable and extensile results. | Thank you for this wise and interesting comment.<br>This was one of the study limitations which is mentioned at the end of the discussion as a limitation | At the end of the discussion under the title "study limitations" |
| Reviewer 3: | | |
| - Please include the 29 item questionnaire and the Likert scale of scoring the answers in the method section. | This is a great and completely correct comment. We added the translated questionnaire as Table3 of the study | Table 3 |
| - In the results section, it is written that the factors have been modified to six ones, but Table 2 contains 7 factors. Please correct it. | Thank you for this wise comment. It is corrected. | The end lines of Results |
| - If there is a specific conclusion or point about question 30 which is open-ended, please mention it. | This is a great and completely correct comment; however, the residents did not reply with any significant comment; which is possibly due to their preference for closed questions. | ------ |

| Reviewer 4 |
| --- |
| Thank you for your great comments and suggestions. ALL your comments about the references were corrected and revised; both in the Introduction and the Discussion |

**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) 7 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
This revised format was completely corrected by author and now it is acceptable for publishing.
Regards

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Dec 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.