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

Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/erms.104620
Published in: Educational Research in Medical Sciences: 9(1); e104620

Peer Review Report for "The Influential Factors in the Performance of Medical Students in the Clinical Competency Exam: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Atiye Faghihi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 May 2020
Revised Date: 15 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 13 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mehdi Mirzaei-Alavijeh : Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 May 2020

Dear AE,
It is accepted by minor revision.
Thanks.

Ramin Abiri: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "Effective factors on the performance of medical students in the clinical
competency exam: a qualitative study" is trying to find the obstacles in an OSCE exam performed in Isfahan U.M.Sciences as the final exam of G.P. course.
I believe that unraveling the mistakes or obstacles of these sort of exams are very important, but unfortunately, this manuscript is unable to assess this goal
1- There are very grammatical mistakes, It is compulsory to consult a professional
2- The assessment is performed on 10 interns who seem to have the same exam. The presented data can not be generalized to other same exams that have been conducted in the Isfahan UMS or other universities,
3- The structure is not appropriate. There is no need for a number in the Methods part: 3.1:

Rigor

4- The structure of the abstract is not correct, the presented materials in the conclusion section ARE RESULTS and not CONCLUSIONS

5- The discussion must be summarized to one-third.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 10 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,

The authors should answer the reviewers' questions and make the necessary corrections.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 10 Jun 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.

Subject: Revision of manuscript " Effective factors on the performance of medical students in the clinical competency exam: a qualitative study", (ID: 104620).

Dear Dr Mansour Rezaei

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to revise my paper on 'Effective factors on the performance of medical students in the clinical competency exam: a qualitative study'. The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful and I appreciate their. I have included the reviewer comments immediately after this letter and responded to them individually, indicating exactly how I addressed each concern or problem and describing the changes we have made. I have tried to answer the questions to the best of my ability based on the information I have. The amendments are marked in the manuscript in the form of track change and highlight. I hope the revised manuscript will better suit of Educational Research in Medical Sciences and I thank you for your continued interest in my research.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

PEER-REVIEWERS' EVALUATIONS

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1

Accepted by minor revision

Reviewer 2

The manuscript entitled "Effective factors on the performance of medical students in the clinical competency exam: a qualitative study" is trying to find the obstacles in an OSCE exam performed in Isfahan U.M. Sciences as the final exam of G.P. course. I believe that unraveling the mistakes or obstacles of these sort of exams are very important, but unfortunately this manuscript is unable to assess this goal

Response: Thank you so much for your positive feedback and good comment. Due to the fact that the structure of the clinical competency exam is similar to the OSCE, the results of this study can to some extent help to solve the problems of similar OSCE. Of course, other researches with different methods of qualitative method can also discover and extract the obstacles and problems of this type of exams, but receiving the opinions and lived experience of stakeholders such as students, which is possible by using qualitative methods, is often

overlooked. Surely, using the results of other studies of a quantitative nature will increase the richness of the present study data. Response to your other comments is as follows:

1- There are very grammatical mistakes, it is compulsory to consult to a professional

Response: In contact with the journal, it was said that professional editing will be done by the journal itself.

2- The assessment is performed on 10 interns which seems to had the same exam. The presented data can not be generalised to other same exams that have been conducted in the Isfahan UMS or other universities,

Response: Thanks for your comment. As you know, in qualitative research, the interview with the participants goes on until data saturation was achieved. In other words the interviews continued until no additional themes related to the study goals emerged. So 10 participants were enough to achieve data saturation. Also, considering that this research is of qualitative research, in this type of research, the researcher is not looking for generalizability. In fact qualitative research is by nature descriptive of the phenomenon from the perspective of participants and from different aspects.

3- The structure is not appropriate. There is no need to a number in the Methods part: 3.1: Rigor

Response: Thanks for your thoughtfulness and the good points you mentioned. All numbers were removed from the entire manuscript body.

4- The structure of the abstract is not correct, the presented materials in the conclusion section ARE RESULTS and not CONCLUSIONS

Response: Thanks for your comment. Amendments were also made to the “conclusion” section in abstract, (Please refer to page:2, line: 29-33)

5- The discussion must be summarized to one third

Response: As your comment, parts of the discussion have been removed and efforts have been made to summarize this section.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 13 Jul 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.