Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 4 · e145593

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effectiveness of Electronic Learning Courses on Neurologist Knowledge of Epilepsy Classification: A Study Based on the Kirkpatrick Model

Zohrehsadat Mirmoghtadaie, Mahmoud Mohammadi, Ali Reza Tavasoli, Reza Shervin Badv, Mahmoud Reza Ashrafi, Gholam Reza Zamani, Sareh Hosseinpour, Abdolmajid Omrani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
31 Jan 2024	14 May 2024	16 Aug 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-145593

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, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 31 Mar 2024 – 9 Apr 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 31 Mar 2024

Dear Editor of Ahvaz Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Greetings and Regards
My review of the article "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Electronic learning Courses on Neurologist Knowledge About Epilepsy Classification: A Study Based on Kirkpatrick Model " is provided below:
abstract
1. The number of words in the abstract is over the limit.
2. The main purpose is not well stated in the introduction of the abstract. Please state the main purpose of the work and the shortcomings of previous studies in this field.
3. In the abstract, the methods should be revised. The location of the study, the sampling method, the year of the study, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the statistical methods and tools used in the study should be mentioned in the abstract.
3. The translation of the article should be revised.
4. In the results section of the abstract, the results should be expressed numerically, and whether they are statistically significant should be mentioned.
5. Electronic education should be added to the keywords.
6. Keywords should be based on MeSH.
Introduction
1- The introduction lacks coherence.
2- What other studies have been conducted in this field, and what were the results?
Methods and methods
1- What is the meaning of 1398 in the first line of the first paragraph?
2- Tables 3 and 4 are incomprehensible. Please explain them.
Discussion
1- In the discussion section, similar studies are not mentioned sufficiently, and the main reason for conducting the study is still not mentioned. Please explain clearly.
2- The limitations of the present study should be mentioned.
references
1- All the references in the introduction of the article are old; at least more than 90% of the references should be from the last 5 years. In the present study, however, out of 35 references, only 5 are from the last 5 years.
with best regards

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions in all sections. Please use previously published related articles in your references. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit it as soon as possible.
With regards

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.

Reviewers' Comments	Reply to Reviewer
The number of words in the abstract is over the limit	The entire abstract is less than 350 words
The main purpose is not well stated in the introduction of the abstract. Please state the main purpose of doing the work and what were the shortcomings of the previous studies in this field.	It was revised
In the abstract, the working method should be modified. The location of the study, the sampling method, the year of the study, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the statistical methods and tools used in the study should be mentioned in the abstract.	It was revised
The translation of the article should be revised.	It was revised
In the abstract results section, the results should be expressed numerically and their significance or not should be mentioned.	It was revised
Electronic education should be added in keywords	It was revised
Keywords should be written based on mesh	It was revised
The introduction does not have enough coherence	It was revised
In the current study field, what other studies have been conducted and what were the results?	It was revised
What is the 1398 in the first line of the first paragraph?	It was revised
Tables 3 and 4 are incomprehensible, please explain them.	It was revised
In the discussion section, similar studies are not mentioned sufficiently and the main reason for conducting the study is still not mentioned. Please explain clearly.	It was revised
The limitations of the present study should be mentioned.	It was revised
All the references of the article in the introduction part are old, at least more than 90% of the references should be related to the last 5 years. While in the present study, out of 35 references, only 5 references are related to the last 5 years.	It was revised

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 16 Aug 2024 – 16 Aug 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 16 Aug 2024

Dear Editor,
The comments have not yet been fully addressed. I think this manuscript needs minor revision before publication.
Many thanks

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Aug 2024

Dear Author,
I think all comments have been made, and this manuscript in the current format is acceptable.
Truly Yours.