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

Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/jcrps.101420
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 9(2); e101420

Peer Review Report for "Nurses' Attitudes Toward Computerized Provider Order Entry (CPOE) System: A Feasibility Study Prior to Implementation"

Author(s): Parasto Amiri, Bahlol Rahimi, Hamid Reza Khalkhali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Feb 2020
Revised Date:	12 Oct 2020
Accepted Date:	30 Oct 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) — 8 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
1- In Research Instrument line 2 replace "Persian" with "farsi"!
1. Demographic variable replace % with percentage character in all of your manuscript
2. In table 2 what is the title of the first column?
3. Replace " more than " with ">"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 16 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 16 Sep 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.

Since nursing staff are one of the main users of CPOE, in this study, we set out to examine factors that may influence CPOE adoption among nurses in a large healthcare organization. The diffusion of innovation theory was used to understand nurses'attitudes and thoughts about implementation and use ofthe CPOE system.

The language of the questionnaire was persian.

Table 1 describes the research population. A total of 273 questionnaires were distributed among the nursing staff. The results showed that 177 nursing staff (64.84%) completed the questionnaire. Approximately, the number of female participants (n = 94, 53.1%) was higher than the number of male participants (n=83, 46.9%).

Questions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No comment	Agree	Strongly agree
Office skills	5.6	9.7	60.7	20.2	3.7
Work on the PC at workplace	8.6	13.9	31.5	37.5	8.6
Ability to install the software	8.6	18	46.8	21.7	4.9
Use Email	38.6	38	0	102	24
Download book and scientific contents from the internet	4.1	0.4	47.9	34.8	12.7
Advantages of using computers in the healthcare	4.1	18	55.8	18	4.1
Computer ability to facilitate daily tasks	3.7	17.2	39	27	13.1

CPOE implementation in male nursing staff was acceptable. The findings showed that the relative advantages, compatibility and complexity among male and females nursing staff were almost equal (gender section from Table 3). Their viewpoint about the relative advantages, compatibility was high and complexity was low ($p > 0.05$)..

Older nursing staff also accepted CPOE implementation hardly (age section from Table 3). Since young nursing staff use technology more often, then they also welcome CPOE. However, older nurses were also more likely to agree that relative advantages of CPOE are high ($p > 0.05$).

The findings showed that the degree of education has the same effect on the recognition of Relative advantages, Compatibility and Complexity of the CPOE system (degree of education

section from Table 3). Although nurses with a baccalaureate degree and more had better computer literacy, the educational level did not affect CPOE acceptance ($p > 0.05$).

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.

Mohammad Hossein Pourasad: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Kambiz Bahaadinbeigy: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript is acceptable for publication in this journal.
Thanks.

Nasrollah Sohrabi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 Oct 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Nasrollah Sohrabi: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Oct 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.