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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.104607
Published in: Health Scope: 10(1); e104607

Peer Review Report for "Identification and Prioritization of Clinical Decision Support Functionalities Built Within A Computerized Provider Order Entry System"

Author(s): Mehrdad Karajizadeh, Farid Zand , Afsaneh Vazin , Mahdi Nasiri , Roxana Sharifian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 May 2020
Revised Date:	23 Nov 2020
Accepted Date:	29 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) — 29 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript doesn't seem to have plagiarism. The method is properly written, however, it is not clear that how the samples are selected. The results are written well and the tables and figures are good. It is better than the search strategy be transferred to the appendices and therefore the first tables would be "clinical decision support functionalities". Besides, some references need to be updated, especially the reference number 24 which is very old. This paper needs minor language editing since there are some writing errors; for instance: not using capital letters for the first word of some sentences.
Generally speaking, this manuscript needs minor revision.
Thank you

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,

This study is valuable and this is a gap in the literature. My decision is acceptance after corrections.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The paper was very interesting and practical research.
Please provide the complete form of abbreviations at the first use of them.
Why were no other hospital experts in your sample?
Why did not you select a higher agreement level for the Delphi method?
Please check the numbers in figure1
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The first round of review for this manuscript is finished. According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".
Best Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Sep 2020

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “MINOR revision”.
Best Regards

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 Editor in Chief of Health Scope Journal,

Please find below the author's response to the appreciated points of reviewers mentioned for the **Manuscript ID: 104607. Title:** Identification and Prioritization of Clinical Decision Support Functionalities Built within A Computerized Provider Order Entry System: From ICU Providerś Viewpoint. We reviewed our manuscript and tried to completely respond to each question separately. In addition, proper modification was made throughout the paper which are blue colored to facilitate tracking. Indeed, we appreciate these valuable comments.

Reviewer #1:

1. The method is properly written, however, it is not clear that how the samples are selected.
   The setting of the study was Intensive Care Units (ICU) in the large 700 -bed Shiraz Nemazee teaching hospital, which is the largest tertiary hospital in the southern of Iran. Providers have used the homegrown Electronic Medical Record (EMR) with CPOE component in the three ICUs at Shiraz Nemazee teaching hospital since October 2015.
   The participants were selected from different stakeholders with experience in CPOE and ICU. Participants were identified base on CPOE steering committee(20) include: 1- Critical care academic member and intensive care unit fellowship who had experience in CPOE and ICU;2- Clinical pharmacist's academic member who had experience in CPOE and ICU; 3- Health information management academic member who had experience in CPOE. With regard to criteria, a list of 12 experts base on feasibility to access consideration were identified. Participants of this study included Twelve participants who worked in the three ICUs at Nemazee hospital (four critical care attending, two clinical pharmacists, four critical care fellowship, two health information management faculty member) had more than 3-year prior experience with homgrown CPOE in Shiraz Nemazee teaching hospital. therefore, 12 participants who met the inclusion criteria. As mentioned in limitation of this study, other hospital experts were not selected in Iran because they are not used CPOE.

2. It is better that the search strategy be transferred to the appendices and therefore the first tables would be "clinical decision support functionalities".
   We revise order of tables. Search strategy (Table 5) was transferred to the appendices.

3. Besides, some references need to be updated, especially reference number24 which is very old.
   References was updated.

4. This paper needs minor language editing since there are some writing errors; for instance: not using capital letters for the first word of some sentences.
   The manuscript was rechecked for spelling and grammatical errors.
   .

Reviewer #3:

1. Please provide the complete form of abbreviations at the first use of them.

We complete form of abbreviations at the first use of them.

2. Why were not other hospital experts in your sample?

   As mentioned in limitation of this study, other hospital was not selected in Iran, because they are not used CPOE or who had not experience in CPOE and ICU.
3. Why did not you select a higher agreement level for delphi method?
   Participants were asked to rate their agreement with each CDS functionality on a 3-point Likert scale, which ranged from “low priority” to “high priority.” The agreement of two third (≥66.6) of participant’s answer was considered as consensus level. Therefore, we considered wide range for consensus level.
4. Please check the numbers in figure1
   The numbers in figure 1 was rechecked and revised

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: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 31 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript was revised based on the previous comments: however, it needs Major Revision.
- Title, it is recommended to remove “From ICU Providers’ Viewpoint” from the title.
- Running title: “Identification and Prioritization of Clinical Decision Support Functionalities”
- The writing of the manuscript is poor yet. It should be revised by an English Language expert. The poorly written manuscript could be rejected in the journal.
Abstract:
- Use the full sentence in the first. E.g. Computerized Provider Order Entry System (CPOE)
- The abstract is poor. Write again. Consult with an expert.
- Abstract: Objective; write the main objective of the study in a short sentence.
- Abstract: Method; describe 12 participants briefly.
- Abstract; Conclusion: remove “A total of 13 clinical decision support functionalities were identified as high priority 51 functionalities for pre-implementation in ICU.” Write the implication of the stud briefly.
Methods:
- Remove” To assure that no other similar systematic review existed, a rapid search was 101 carried out on Cochrane library databases to find any systematic review papers on CDS 102 functionalities integrated into CPOE.” Write again, e.g. Cochrane library database was checked for….
- Indicate used keywords in the systematic review phase.
- Remember: Nemazee teaching hospital is the largest tertiary hospital in the south of Iran.
- Methods; lines 134 - 145; write briefly.
- Write the Method section again.
- Remove Table 2. Write the age and job experience of the participants in the method section.
Discussion
- Remove “from the viewpoints of intensivists, clinical pharmacists, and health 235 information management experts.”
- Remove” In the first step of this study, 60 CDS functionalities in 236 CPOE were identified through scoping review of the literature. 13 out of 60 clinical decisions 237 supports were identified as a high priority in 2 iterative Delphi rounds. 8 out of 12 of the 238 participants were intensivists” this sentence has been mentioned in the result section.
- Write again the first paragraph in the discussion section. Mention the main result of the

study, compare it with other studies, and write the author's interpretation.
- Remove lines 297 - 299
- Use of the following papers that have been done in your setting:
- Designing Computerized Provider Order Entry Software in Iran: The Nurses' and Physicians' Viewpoints
- Evaluating Physicians and Nurses' Satisfaction with Computerized Physician Order Entry System in Iran
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 8 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The second round of revision for this manuscript is finished. According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs "Major Revision".
Best Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 8 Nov 2020

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “Major revision”.
Best Regards

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.

Dear Editor in Chief of Health Scope Journal,

Please find below the author's response to the appreciated points of reviewers mentioned for the Manuscript ID: 104607. Title: Identification and Prioritization of Clinical Decision Support Functionalities Built within A Computerized Provider Order Entry System. We reviewed our manuscript and tried to completely respond to each question separately. In addition, proper modification was made throughout the paper which are blue colored to facilitate tracking. Indeed, we appreciate these valuable comments.

Reviewer Number 1

.Title, it is recommended to remove “From ICU Providerṡ Viewpoint” from title

The statement was removed

Running title: “Identification and Prioritization of Clinical Decision Support ″Functionalities

.The running title was revised

Writing of the manuscript is poor yet. It should be revised by an English .Language expert. Poorly written manuscript could be rejected in the journal

The manuscript was revised for spelling and grammatical errors by English expert

:Abstract

Use of the full sentence in the first . E.g. Computerized Provider Order Entry System (CPOE)

The statement was revised

.Abstract is poor. Write again. Consult with an expert

Abstract was modified

.Abstract: Objective; write the main objective of the study in a short sentence

Objective section of abstract was changed” Clinical Decision Support (CDS)functionalities in Computerized Provider Order Entry System (CPOE) need to be identified by the institutional healthcare providers in developing countries. In this regard, CDS functionalities should be a priority for execution of CPOE. Thus, our study aim was identification and prioritization of CDS functionalities in CPOE. ”

.Abstract: Method; describe about 12 participants briefly

Participates of this study was described

Twelve participants who worked in the three ICUs at Nemazee hospital (four critical care " attending, two clinical pharmacists, four critical care fellowship, two health information management faculty member) had more than 3-year prior experience with homegrown CPOE ".in Shiraz Nemazee teaching hospital

Abstract; Conclusion: remove "A total of 13 clinical decision support functionalities were identified as high priority 51 functionalities for pre-.implementation in ICU." Write implication of the stud briefly

The statement was removed

:Methods

Remove" To assure that no other similar systematic review existed, a rapid search was 101 carried out on Cochrane library databases to find any systematic review papers on CDS 102 functionalities integrated into CPOE." Write again, ….e.g. Cochrane library database was checked for

The statement was removed

.Indicate used key words in systematic review phase

Keywords in systematic review phase was indicated in Table 1

Remember: Nemazee teaching hospital is the largest tertiary hospital in the .south of Iran

The statement was revised

.Methods; line 134 - 145; write briefly

The statement was revised

.Write Method section again

Remove Table 2. Write age and job experience of the participants in method .section

The statement was removed

Discussion

Remove "from the viewpoints of intensivists, clinical pharmacists, and health ".235 information management experts

The statement was removed

Remove" In the first step of this study, 60 CDS functionalities in 236 CPOE were identified through scoping review of the literature. 13 out of 60 clinical

decision 237 supports were identified as high priority in 2 iterative Delphi rounds. 8 out of 12 of the 238 participants were intensivists" this sentence has .mentioned in result section

The statement was removed

Write again the first paragraph in discussion section. Mention to main result of .the study, compare it with other studies and write authors interpretation

The statement was revised

Remove lines 297 – 299

The statement was removed

:Use of the following papers that has been done in your setting

.these was a valuable paper. Thus, we cited these paper in manuscript

Designing Computerized Provider Order Entry Software in Iran: The Nurses' and Physicians' Viewpoints

Evaluating Physicians and Nurses' Satisfaction with Computerized Physician Order Entry System in Iran

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 20 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is now acceptable for publication. The decision for this manuscript is "Accept".
Best regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Dec 2020

Dear Author
Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best regards