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 Medical Education
Article DOI: 10.5812/jme.103399
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 19(2); e103399

Peer Review Report for "The Efficacy of a Web-Based Logbook in the Monitoring of Educational Activities of Emergency Medicine Residents"

Author(s): Ehsan Karimialavijeh, Javad Seyedhosseini, Ali Labaf, Maziar Ashrafi, Narges Mohammadrezaei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 7 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 14 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)

16 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Title
1) Article TITLE is proper.
2) The title reflects the content appropriately.
3) There is no abbreviation in the TITLE.
4) The subject is almost new and valuable.
5) The Authors' names and institutional affiliations are proper.
6) The source (s) of support are not mentioned.
Abstract
7) ABSTRACT is properly structured
8) There are 252 words in the ABSTRACT that is appropriate.
9) The ABSTRACT is accurate and adequate
10) There are 5 keywords, one of which (resident monitoring) does not exactly match the Mesh.
Introduction
11) the objectives Are clearly stated.

INTRODUCTION include: “What we know”, “What we don’t know” and “Aims”.

Materials And Methods

12) Sampling method is not mentioned.

13) Study Design is not mentioned.

14) The sample seems adequate.

15) Subjects Representative of Target Population.

16) Calculation or justification of sample size is not provided.

17) Control Subjects is Appropriate.

18) The power of the study has not been declared.

19) Actual P values for primary analyses have Reported.

20) Blinding of Investigators has not included in the study.

21) Sufficient detail can be identified for procedures.

22) Entry/exit criteria have not explained.

23) Statistical Analysis is Appropriate.

24) Statistical methods can be identified without ambiguity.

25) Ethical Considerations has not explained.

Results

26) The interpretation of RESULTS is acceptable.

27) RESULTS recorded appropriately.

28) The TABLES are adequate and appropriate.

29) Results presentation is in logical sequence in the text.

30) There is no Appendix for extra or supplementary materials.

Discussion

31) The discussion is very brief, not rich enough.

32) The conclusion is logical and supported by the discussion.

References

33) References are not for the last 5 years.

34) Vancouver type of writing references is observed.

General Review

35) Proper Style for Medical Writing.

36) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used.

37) Proper English Grammar and Writing.

38) Discussion is too short.

39) What additional information would you need to reproduce this study?

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 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 major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Oct 2020

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

October 7, 2020

Dr. Shahram Yazdani
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Medical Education

Dear Editor,

It is with excitement that I resubmit to you a revised version of manuscript 103399
The efficacy of a web-based logbook in the monitoring of educational activities of emergency medicine residents. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. I appreciate the time and detail provided by each reviewer and by you and have incorporated the suggested changes into the manuscript to the best of my ability. The manuscript has certainly benefited from these insightful revision suggestions. I look forward to working with you and the reviewers to move this manuscript closer to publication in the journal of medical education.

I have responded specifically to suggestions below.

Reviewers' comments:

1. *Sampling method is not mentioned.*

We have added the below sentence into the methods:

All residents and faculty members who had been registered on the web-based logbook were surveyed through emails. If any user had not logged into the web-based logbook during the study period, he/she would have been excluded from the study.

2. Study Design is not mentioned

We have added the below sentence into the methods:

This was a cross-sectional study conducted in the emergency department of an university affiliated teaching hospital in Tehran, Iran.

3. *Calculation or justification of sample size is not provided.*

We have added the below sentence into the methods:

Since this was a pilot study sample size was estimated by Rules of thumb so we estimated that 40 surveys would provide 80 percent power to detect differences between the web-based and paper logbooks.

4. *The power of the study has not been declared.*

We have added the below sentence into the methods:
Since this was a pilot study sample size was estimated by Rules of thumb so we estimated that 40 surveys would provide 80 percent power to detect differences between the web-based and paper logbooks.

5. *Blinding of Investigators have not included in the study.*

Surveys were completed anonymously and researchers were blind to the responders' identities.

6. *Entry / exit criteria has not explained.*

All residents and faculty members who had been registered on the web-based logbook were surveyed through emails. If any user had not logged into the web-based logbook during the study period, he/she would have been excluded from the study.

7. *Ethical Considerations has not explained.*

Surveys were completed anonymously and researchers were blind to the responders' identities.
The ethics committee of Tehran University of Medical Sciences approved the conduct of the study.

8. *Discussion is too short*

We have extended the discussion and added more references.

Sincerely

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) 14 Oct 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Oct 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 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.