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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.114868
Published in: Health Scope: 10(3); e114868

Peer Review Report for "Nurses' Decisions in Error Reporting and Disclosing Based on Error Scenarios: A Mixed-method Study"

Author(s): Zhila Najafpour, Mohamad Arab, Somayeh Biparva Haghighi , Kamran Shayanfard, Mehdi Yaseri, Maryam Hatamizadeh, Zahra Goudarzi , Fatemeh Bahramnezhad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Apr 2021
Revised Date: 10 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 18 Sep 2021

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) — 11 May 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "Nurses' Decisions in Error Reporting, and Disclosure to patients Based on Error Scenarios" which you have been reviewed and needs revision before it can be published in the Health Scope Journal. The reviewer comments are included in the manuscript file with comments. Please read the above file carefully and reformat the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 May 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs major revision and rewrite it again. It cannot be published under this structure.
The manuscript should be revised by a native English language expert.
Abstract
- Method: what is e embedded design?

- Describe the setting of the study
- How 491 nurses were calculated and selected?
- What questionnaire? It was a standard or research-made tool?
- Result: Based on SEM analysis, the most important perceived barriers were educational and motivational domains (ES: 1.33, SE: 0.16)." it is a repeated sentence.
- The structure of the results section is not appropriate. Express the quantitative part first and then the qualitative section
- Conclusion: write a conclusion section based on the findings of the study.
- Introduction: discuss about the prevalence of medical errors by nurses in world and Iran.
- Describe the benefit of MEs disclosure to patients.
- What authors said, "there are no published formal statistics about the rate of medical errors"? Numerous studies have been published in this field in Iran.
- Method" the quantitative part was completed by administrating a questionnaire devised by researchers". Rewrite again.
- What is the criterion for classifying hospitals by bed? Hospitals with less than 100 beds are usually known as a small hospital.
- What sampling formula was used?
- Exclusion criteria should be mentioned.
- How the scenarios were selected?
- How 22 participants were selected? What criteria were considered?

Results:

- Where does the findings section start? It is ambiguous.
- The results of the quantitative part should be well mentioned in the text.
- Some tables do not have numbers and are not mentioned in the text.
- What use of SEM analysis?
- The qualitative analysis section was based on which method? Give a full explanation.
- Use of new references.

Best

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,

The decision is Major revision. The authors should find the attached files.

Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Jun 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Major 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 reviewers

We appreciate the time and effort that you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. The changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewer 1

The manuscript should be revised by a native English language expert.

- The manuscript has been edited by a native English expert.

Abstract

Method: what is embedded design?

- This method can be used when a researcher needs to embed a qualitative component within a quantitative design because a single data set is not sufficient. Then we made decision to embed qualitative data within a quantitative methodology for more clarification. In other words, in our study, qualitative phase had a supplemental role within the quantitative design. For instance, we attempted to understand nurse's error on error detection, reporting and disclosure by using several scenarios and cases that might be take place in the hospital. Clearly it can be clarified nurses' perceptions more than filling a questionnaire. Then we choose a mixed method with embedded deign.

Describe the setting of the study.

- Added. P1, in the methods section.

How 491 nurses were calculated and selected?

- Added. P1, in the methods section.

What questionnaire? It was a standard or research-made tool?

- Added. We used a research-made tool. P1, in the methods section.

Result: Based on SEM analysis, the most important perceived barriers were educational and motivational domains (ES: 1.33, SE: 0.16)." it is a repeated sentence.

- Removed. P1

The structure of the results section is not appropriate. Express the quantitative part first and then the qualitative section.

- Edited. P1, in the result section.

Conclusion: write a conclusion section based on the findings of the study.

- Done. P1, in the conclusion section.

Introduction

Discuss about the prevalence of medical errors by nurses in world and Iran.

Describe the benefit of MEs disclosure to patients.

- Your mentioned evidence has been added in the introduction section. P: 2 Line 4 – 8 & 13-18

What authors said, "there are no published formal statistics about the rate of medical errors"? Numerous studies have been published in this field in Iran.

- Many thanks for your valuable comment, the introduction section is edited. P: 2 Line 4 - 8

Method

The quantitative part was completed by administrating a questionnaire devised by researchers". Rewrite again.

- Done. P 2

What is the criterion for classifying hospitals by bed? Hospitals with less than 100 beds are usually known as a small hospital. What sampling formula was used?

- The process of sampling and its formula have been added in the method section. P: 3 line 10 -17
- Dear reviewer we had 16 hospitals, so we needed to categorize them based on a criterion. We though hospital's bed numbers can be provided information on hospital's capacities, clearly large hospital will have a greater number of nurses. Then we selected hospital's number of beds category for having in minimum one hospital in every category. We categorized the hospital similar to a published article (1).We selected the mentioned classification measure because number of bed in most of the hospitals was more than 100 beds.

Exclusion criteria should be mentioned.

- The study does not have any exclusion criteria.

How the scenarios were selected?

- P: 4 line 3 -7
    - As we mentioned in the method section, the scenarios have been formulated based on search of literature and finalized by an expert panel including physicians and nurses and another related expert in field of medical error. The scenarios have been attached in the supplementary section.

How 22 participants were selected? What criteria were considered?

- The descriptions have been mentioned in the qualitative phase in the supplementary because of journals' word limitation.
    - The five hospitals to be interviewed after the questionnaire data had been collected and analyzed. In determining which nurses were to be interviewed, the questionnaire domains responses were summarized and sorted by the mean score. Nurses who reported very low levels in at least three of domains were invited to interview. The interviewees represented a well-dispersed range of hospitals. In this process, we included nurses who had consent for coding their questionnaire for the next phase of study.

Results

Where does the findings section start? It is ambiguous.

The results of the quantitative part should be well mentioned in the text.
Some tables do not have numbers and are not mentioned in the text.
What use of SEM analysis?
The qualitative analysis section was based on which method?
Give a full explanation.
Use of new references.

- The results of the quantitative phase have been edited based on the study's aim. P 5
- SEM analysis description has been added in the analysis section. P 4 line 22-25
- More explanation in the qualitative analysis has been added. P4 Line 20-30

Reference

1) Paul A, et.al Patient and hospital characteristics associated with traditional measures of inpatient quality of care for patients with heart failure, 2012, American Heart Journal

Response to Reviewer 2

- Reference numbers?! It seems that based on new studies, you can provide more accurate data in this regard.
  - "Edited. P1
- Qualitative??
  - Edited.
- Please mention the names of the hospitals.
  - Done. P3 line 2
- significant level in this study is less than 0.05
  - Edited.
- Please write the references according to Vancouver style.
  - Done. P11

- Please explain about sample size calculation.
  - Edited. P 3 Line 3-17
- It is suggested to write the significant level of p-value: A p-value of <0.05 was considered Significant.
  - Edited.
- It's better to mention "after confirming the reliability and validity of this questionnaire…
  - Done.
- Please explain about method of sampling more exactly. Please explain in more detail how to select samples. How was the specified sample divided between 5 hospitals? How was the specified sample of each hospital divided between the wards? In fact, you should first calculate the sample ratio of each hospital based on criteria. Then specify the ratio of each ward in each hospital.
  - As you mentioned we calculated sample ratio for each hospital.
  - More description is added in the sampling section. P3
- Please indicate what parameters were measured.
  - It is included in appendix part 1.
- r is dropped.
  - Thanks. Edited.
- face-to-face interview?
  - Added.
- Please description of Quantitative variables with mean±SD
  - Added.
- please add number
  - Added.
- Educational factor
  - Edited.
- please mention " Bivariate analysis " instead of" Univariate Analysis " in the label of table2

- Edited.

o also add Statistical tests name in below the table

- Added.

o discussion section writing needs to be revised with newer article

- The discussion section has been edited with up-dated evidence.

Response to Reviewer 3

When you use this term (some studies), you have to cite several sources. Not just a resource.

- The introduction section has been edited. P1 highlighted in yellow

Please specify where this statistic is related to? And what year is it?

- The introduction section has been edited. P1 highlighted in yellow

Qualitative

- Edited

>500

- Thanks for your consideration. Edited.

target population is true.

- Thanks. Edited.

Please state the formula for determining the sample size.

- The sampling formula has been added. P 3

Please explain in more detail how to select samples. How was the specified sample divided between 5 hospitals? How was the specified sample of each

hospital divided between the wards? In fact, you should first calculate the sample ratio of each hospital based on criteria. Then specify the ratio of each ward in each hospital.

- As you mentioned we calculated sample ratio for each hospital.
- More description is added in the sampling section. P3

Ethical considerations!!!

- Added.

Based on which criteria? Purposive sampling

- The descriptions have been mentioned in the qualitative phase in the supplementary because of journals' word limitation.
  - The five hospitals to be interviewed after the questionnaire data had been collected and analyzed. In determining which nurses were to be interviewed, the questionnaire domains responses were summarized and sorted by the mean score. Nurses who reported very low levels in at least three of domains were invited to interview. The interviewees represented a well-dispersed range of hospitals. In this process, we included nurses who had consent for coding their questionnaire for the next phase of study.

Although the issue of patient safety and error reporting has been a major issue in clinical governance and hospital accreditation programs, you have not mentioned these programs and their impact in your article. Empowerment of human resources has been seriously considered in the accreditation program in the past years. Definitely one of the items of empowerment of medical staff, especially nurses, has been patient safety and error reporting. Please refer to these programs appropriately in your article.

- Many thanks. You mentioned an important point, I attempted to add your mentioned issue in the discussion. Obviously, I think published articles related to the accreditation impact of our hospitals are considerably low. Then it can be a great topic for the future to investigate the impact of accreditation programs on quality and safety in hospitals. Thanks for your valuable point of view.

Please report the p-value number.

- Added in the table 1.

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)** 16 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs Major revision.
- The manuscript should be revised by a native expert. Grammatical and punctuation errors are seen in the manuscript and title.
- Abstract: Indicate the year that the study was carried out.
- Abstract, result section, It is recommended that you write this: Error scenarios were thematized into three categories: error perception (including …….) error reporting (including…..), and error disclosure (including….).
- Abstract: check again the results section. error reporting is repeated twice.
- Again: The manuscript should be read several times by the authors to correct possible errors.
- Indicate regression results with their significant scores.
Method:
- In the method section, mention why mixed methods embedded design was used.
- "The hospitals were divided into three categories based on the number of beds". Write reference/s for hospital category.
- "Sampling in each type of ward was randomly done" what kind of randomization?
- The complete questionnaire should be attached to the manuscript as an appendix.
- Describe more about the reliability and validity examination of the questionnaire in the text. Detail is necessary.
- Write the ethical code in the method section.
- What is the purpose of the quantitative part of the study? Indicate in method
- How trustworthiness and Credibility of the Interview guide was approved?
- People who get higher scores in the quantitative section may not necessarily be quality samples. In quality sampling, you seek to gain the experiences of persons who also have the appropriate expressive ability. How do you justify this?
Results:
- Table 1. The number of questions in each dimension should be stated in the method section. Again, the complete questionnaire should be attached to the manuscript as an appendix.
- The authors indicate that " Table 1 presents the demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents." Check your Tables. Again, the manuscript should be read several times by the authors to correct possible errors.
- Check appendix 4: Demographic characteristics. Some errors are seen in this Table.

- Tables related to Appendix 4 should be mentioned in the main text of the manuscript as the main Tables, not as an appendix.
- Where is Regression analysis?

Discussion:

- Why use "In sum" in the discussion section? Use of academic phrases in the manuscript. e.g. "in general"
- Mention the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of the study

where is the conclusion section of the manuscript??? see journal guideline.

- Several studies have been conducted in this field. Use these studies to improve the quality of the manuscript.
- A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Medical Error Rate in Iran: 2005-2019.
- Medical error as a challenge in Iran's health system
- Medical errors and barriers to reporting in ten hospitals in southern Iran

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Jul 2021

Dear EIC,

For the second round of peer review , the manuscript need Major revision.

Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Aug 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “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 editorial office

We appreciate the time and effort you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper during two rounds of review. The changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewer comments and concerns.

Reviewer 1

The manuscript needs Major revision.

The manuscript should be revised by a native expert. Grammatical and punctuation errors are seen in the manuscript and title.

☑ Edited.

Abstract

Indicate to the year that the study carried out.

☑ Added. P1

Abstract, result section, It is recommended that you write this: Error scenarios were thematized into three categories: error perception (including ……..) error reporting (including…..) and error disclosure (including….).

☑ Edited. P1

Abstract: check again results section. error reporting is repeated twice.

Again: The manuscript should be read several times by the authors to correct possible errors.

☑ Edited.

Indicate regression results with its significant scores.

☑ Added

Method

In the method section, mention why mixed methods embedded design was used.

☑ Added.

"The hospitals were divided into three categories based on the number of beds". Write reference/s for hospital category.

☑ Added. P2

"Sampling in each type of ward was randomly done" what kind of randomization?

☑ Added. P3

The complete questionnaire should be attached to the manuscript as appendix.

☑ Added.

Describe more about reliability and validity examination of the questionnaire in the text.

☑ Added. P 3 Line 3-13

Write ethical code in method section.

☑ Added.

What is the purpose of quantitative part of the study? Indicate in method

☑ Added. P3 Line 20.

How trustworthiness and Credibility of the Interview guide was approved?

☑ Added. P4

People who get higher scores in the quantitative section may not necessarily be quality samples. In quality sampling, you seek to gain the experiences of persons who also have appropriate expressive ability. How do you justify this?

☑ Dear reviewer, as you correctly mentioned, we wanted to select nurses who do not intend to report their errors. A nurse who answered very high to the studied domains reported error, while we aimed to interpret the reasons for not reporting error. Then We selected the nurses who reported very low levels to the studied domains. For this reason, in determining which nurses have to interview, the questionnaire domains responses were summarized and sorted by the mean score. Nurses who reported very low levels in at least three domains were invited to interview.

Table 1. The number of questions in each dimension should be stated in the method section. Again, the complete questionnaire should be attached to the manuscript as appendix.

☑ Added. P3

Results

The authors indicate that " Table 1 presents the demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents." Check your Tables. Again, the manuscript should be read several times by the authors to correct possible errors.

☑ Added

Check appendix 4: Demographic characteristics. Some errors are seen in this Table.

Tables related to Appendix 4 should be mentioned in the main text of the manuscript as the main Tables, not as an appendix.

☑ Demographic table is added.

☑ It is worth thanking if you are allowed to maintain table 2 in the appendix because of the word counts. But we added the most critical data in table 2 in the text.

Where is Regression analysis?

☑ They are reported in the table 2.

Discussion

Why used of "In sum" in discussion section? Use of academic phrases in the manuscript. e.g. "in general"

☑ Edited

Mention to the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of the study

☑ Added.

where is conclusion section of the manuscript??? see journal guideline.

☑ Edited

Several studies have been conducted in this field. Use these studies to improve the quality of the manuscript.

- A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Medical Error Rate in Iran: 2005-2019.

- Medical error as a challenge in Iran’s health system
- Medical errors and barriers to reporting in ten hospitals in southern Iran\

☑ Many Thanks. Done.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 4 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
The previous comments appropriately had been revised and answered. Also, the following comment should be considerd;
- The introduction section is summarized. Write more about the importance of the Medical error and its reporting and obstacles in developing countries, especially in Iran
- Method section: write more detail on the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. What peer review method? Who persons? Cronbach's alpha?
- Results: Check again Table 1. Gender and marital status.
- Table 2. Write complete title
- It is suggested that the questionnaire along with the answers given to each question be included as a table if possible
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 4 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs Minor revision.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Sep 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need "Minor revision".
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 editorial office

We appreciate the time and effort that you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper during three rounds of review. The changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewer comments.

- The introduction section is summarized. Write more about the importance of the medical error and its reporting and obstacles in developing countries, especially in Iran.
  - Done.
- Method section: write more detail on the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. What peer review method? Who persons? Cronbach's alpha?
  - Done.
- Results: Check again Table 1. Gender and marital status.
  - In the study, 491 nurses participated; totally 218 nurses (44%) were married and 434 nurses (88%) were female.
- Table 2. Write complete title/
  - Done.
- It is suggested that the questionnaire along with the answers given to each question be included as a table if possible
  - Added in appendix 4.
  - Meanwhile the dataset generated during the current study are available from the corresponding author by email.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 11 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled" Nurses' Decisions in Error Reporting and Disclosing Based on Error Scenarios: a mixed-method study" has been revised based on the previous comments. Now, it could be published in the Journal.
Best,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 11 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
In the fourth round of review, the manuscript revision is acceptable.
Sincerely,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (3) 18 Sep 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best Regards