Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 9 · Issue 2 · e100847

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation and Comparison of the Characteristics of a Capable Teacher in the Viewpoint of the Students and Professors of the Medical, Dentistry, and Pharmacy Schools of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Iran

Mostafa Godiny, Atefeh Khavid, Sayed Mohammad Hossain Zamani Mosevib

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Jul 2020	25 Nov 2020	28 Nov 2020	10.5812/erms.100847

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 15
3 Revision 2 16
Authors' reply to reviewers 17
Reviewer and editor comments 19

1 Original submission

1 comment · 28 Jul 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 28 Jul 2020

Hi Dear editor
The article is commendable because it deals with the characteristics of a professor, but the following points need to be considered by the authors:
Introduction
Few articles have been used in the introduction.
Most articles examine the characteristics of a good teacher from the perspective of professors and students.
What is the main difference between this work and the work of others?
Materials and methods
The time of the study is not specified.
The census sampling method is mentioned, but the question is, does the medical school have only 80 students? Please explain how 80 students were selected. What year were the incoming students?
As for the professors, do the three major schools of medicine, pharmacy and dentistry have only 42 professors? Please explain clearly.
Results
It would be better to report the P value and differences in the tables.
Would it be better to mention the demographic characteristics of the people in the study in the form of a table?
The information presented in the tables is descriptive; it is better to use statistical tests to examine the relationships.
Discussion and conclusion:
Few studies have been used in this section for comparison.
What is the practical conclusion of this study?
What strategies do you suggest for improving training based on the results?
Mention the limitations of the study, if any.
What topics do you suggest for future researchers based on the results of the study?
References
References No. 6 and 11 are very old. Please replace them with newer resources, if possible.

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 editor

Manuscript ID 100847 entitled " **Evaluation the features of a capable teacher from the viewpoint of students and professors of medical, dentistry and pharmacy faculties of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences**" which we submitted to Educational Research in Medical Sciences, has edited based on editorial board and reviewer comments.

Referee 1:

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your immense and scientific comments, your comments were carefully considered. It makes a better manuscript and will be my guides to conduct future studies.

Comments to the Author:

The article is commendable because it deals with the characteristics of a professor, but the following points need to be considered by the authors:

Introduction

1. Few articles have been used in the introduction.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added new articles to the Introduction Section. (line 12, paragraph 1, page 1; line 20, paragraph 3, page 1; line 2, paragraph 1, page 2).

2. Most articles examine the characteristics of a good teacher from the perspective of professors and students. What is the main difference between this work and the work of others?

   Action) In most studies in this field, practical teaching is not separated from theoretical teaching and the researches done in the field of dentistry that have acted separately between the characteristics of the professor in the two fields of theoretical and practical teaching are very limited. In this study, professors' self-assessment was also performed, which has been seen in fewer studies.

Materials and methods

3. The time of the study is not specified?

Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added the time of the study to the materials and methods section. (line 11, paragraph 3, page 2).

4. The census sampling method is mentioned, but the question is, does the medical school have only 80 students? Please mention how 80 students were selected? What year were the incoming students?

   As for the professors, do the three major schools of medicine, pharmacy and dentistry have only 42 professors? Please explain clearly.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, in this study random sampling method was conducted but the census sampling method is mentioned. This error was corrected in the materials and methods section (line 13-14, paragraph 3, page 2).

   Results

5. It was better to mention the amount of P value and differences in the tables.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we mentioned the amount of P value and differences in the tables. (pages 16 and 17).

6. Would it be better to mention the demographic characteristics of the people in the study in the form of a table?

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added the demographic characteristics of the people in the study in the form of a table. (pages 15).

7. The information presented in the tables is descriptive, it is better to use statistical tests to examine the relationships.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, we used statistical tests to examine the relationships and mean±SD, the amount of P value and differences presented in the tables.

Discussion and conclusion:

8. Few studies have been used in this section for comparison.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added comparing studies to the discussion. (line 10-19, paragraph 3, page 9; line 2-6, paragraph 1, page 11).

9. What is the practical conclusion of this study?

Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added the practical conclusion to the manuscript (line 10-19, paragraph 2, page 11).

10. What strategies do you suggest for improving training based on results?

1) Action) It is suggested that the views of the students of each faculty be categorized to the officials and faculty members of that faculty in order to have a clear understanding of the views and expectations of students in order to improve the educational process in these faculties. Also, it is recommended that such evaluations be carried out periodically and at specific times in order to take appropriate measures in accordance with the changes made in the views of students and professors.

11. Mention the limitations of the study, if any.

Action) One of the limitations of the present study is that it does not address the characteristics of professional ethics of a capable professor in a coherent manner, which is recommended to be considered in future research.

12. What topics do you suggest for future researchers based on the results of the study?

Action) Considering that in addition to the teacher factor, other factors such as student characteristics affect the quality of higher education. This

feature can be as a confounding factor to influence other effective factors, therefore it is recommended to evaluate this factor in future research.

Referee 2:

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your immense and scientific comment, your comment were carefully considered. It makes a better manuscript and will be my guides to conduct future studies.

Comments to the Author:

Title and abstract

1. Limit the number of words in the abstract to 150 words. Short introduction in the abstract.

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we edited the abstract. (line 6-22, pages 1).

2. In the article, a descriptive-analytical study is mentioned, while in the abstract, a cross-sectional study

   Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we edited the type of study in the abstract. (line 6-22, pages 1).

3. The results and conclusion show that the manuscript is a comparative study

4. Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added comparing studies to the discussion. (line 10-19, paragraph 3, page 9; line 2-6, paragraph 1, page 11).

Method

5. Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants.

Action) Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Students: Inclusion criteria was students in the third semester or higher, spending at least two semesters in college and having the consent to enter the study. Guest students and students who were in the first year of study or not have the consent to participate were excluded from the study.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for professors: Being a faculty member and having a course unit, whether basic science or clinical courses, and having the consent to participate in the study was the inclusion criteria. The professors not have the consent to enter the study were excluded from the study.

6. Explain how the study size was arrived at. Mentioned in the manuscript was the census sampling method. Was the number of students in the three faculties 192? Was the number of professors in the three faculties 42? Statistical population research and study size?

7. Action) Thanks for your comment, in this study random sampling method was conducted but the census sampling method is mentioned. This error was corrected in the materials and methods section (line 13-14, paragraph 2, page 3).

8. Describe all statistical methods. Delete Line 76 “In the descriptive statistics, measures of centrality and dispersion were reported along with the table”.

Line 78 “If the data were normally distributed, thus the data were analyzed by paired t test or analysis of variance (ANOVA). If the data were not normally distributed, thus the data were analyzed by Mann-Whitney U or Kruskal Wallis.” The word “If” is not true and it`s better to use “because of” with past verb.

Action) Thanks for your comment, your suggestion was done in the manuscript (line 1-7, paragraph 1, page 4).

Results

9. Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders.

Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we added the demographic characteristics of the people in the study in the form of a table. (pages 15).

10. Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest

Action) Thanks for your comment, data from all participants in the study were reported, and there were no any participants with missing data.

11. Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures

Action) Thanks for your comment, significant events are reported in the results section.

12. The results differ from the main purpose of the study. This study compares the views of students and teachers and compares it between the three faculties

Action) Thanks for your comment, the aim of this study was to compare the views of students with professors of medical, dental and pharmacy faculties of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences about the characteristics of a capable professor in the field of theoretical teaching, practical teaching and evaluation. In the results section, this comparison has been made between the views of students and professors of each faculty and between faculties, and the results have been presented.

13. Mention the most important results in the text and complete the table with P-value

Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion we mentioned the amount of P value and differences in the tables. (pages 16 and 17).

Discussion

14. Review the discussion in proportion to the change in the purpose of the study.

Action) Thanks for your comment, according to your suggestion is review the discussion in proportion to the change in the purpose of the study.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

This study needs major revision

EIC Decision:

1. Use the word "Faculty" instead of "department" in manuscript.

Action) Was done.

2- The census method is wrong

Action) Thanks for your comment, in this study random sampling method was conducted but the census sampling method is mentioned. This error was corrected in the materials and methods section. (line 13-14, paragraph 3, page 2).

Once again thank you for the revision.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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: Thank you, respected author. Most of the shortcomings of the article have been resolved; please also correct the following:

Thank you, respected reviewer

The requested revisions have been made and are highlighted in the text of the article; they comprise the following:

1- State the statistical population (how many professors and how many students you had in total, and how many of them were selected).

Response: The statistical population was stated (page 3, lines 11-15).

2- Lines 1 to 7 on page 4: the sentences were taken out of the conditional form and past-tense verbs were used (to be corrected in terms of writing).

Response: The requested correction was made.

3- State the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

Response: The validity and reliability of the questionnaire were stated in the text of the article (page 3, line 21 and page 4, lines 1-2).

4- Present the demographic characteristics in the text, and also state the scores that individuals obtained in each section of the questionnaire

Response: The demographic characteristics were added to the text (page 3, lines 15-20). Given that the study conducted is a comparative study between the faculties of the university of medical sciences, the statistical comparisons performed are stated in the text of the Results section and are also presented as several tables, and because of the large volume it is not possible to present in the text of the article the scores that individuals obtained in each section of the questionnaire.

5- In Table 5, write the standard deviation of clinical education and theoretical education.

Response: In Table 5, the standard deviation of clinical education and theoretical education has been written.

6- Please attach the questionnaire as a separate file.

Response: The questionnaire was attached as a separate file.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.