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.107227
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 19(2); e107227

Peer Review Report for "E-learning: The Scenario During COVID-19 Pandemic"

Author(s): Archana Chirag Buch, Hetal Rathod , Raj Kamble

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 1 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 7 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) — 4 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The subject of the article is new but it is not innovative in method and results. selected population has not been described well. The field of research is not explained clearly. The title is not related to the method and results. It is recommended to do this with a specified sample size but with a random sample. The reliability of the questionnaire is not reported. Although the limitations of the article are outlined in the discussion, it is recommended that it be published as a brief report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Revision is needed in my opinion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 23 Aug 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)

23 Aug 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.

We would like to thank reviewers and the editorial team.

We appreciate the comments provided by the respected reviewers.

We have tried to answers the points which have been identified by the reviewers.

Please let us know any other points to be added or modifications required.

Reviewers' Comments:

Q.1 The subject of the article is new but it is not innovative in method and results

Ans.1 In our set up e learning is an innovative method in medical education as majority of the education is by traditional mode of teaching. Due to COVID 19 Pandemic, e learning has become mandatory. So it is in in a way major change for both faculty and students and we wanted to study the change in scenario of e learning in medical education during this period.

Q.2 Selected population has not been described well

Ans.2 It is described in the abstract as well as in the methods section of main article.

All undergraduate students of government and private health science institutions of various states across India whose education was affected due to pandemic and willing to participate in the survey were included in the study

Q.3 The field of research is not explained clearly-

Ans.3 educational research, has been included in the introduction section.

Q.4 The title is not related to the method and results

Ans. 4 The modifications are done in abstract (background and methods) and also in the methodology section of main article, so as to justify the title.

Q.5 It is recommended to do this with a specified sample size but with random sample

Ans.5 The sample size was calculated, assuming 50% students are using e- learning package, (as the data of e learning by institutions was not available). Hence, taking allowable error of 5%, at 95% confidence level, calculated sample size was 384 using Open Epi software version 3.01.

Since the response rate in online surveys is unpredictable, we circulated the form in various college groups and we got response from 914 students.

Q.6 Reliability of questionnaire is not reported

Ans.6 Reliability of the Questionnaire is 0.74, has been included in the revised manuscript.

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) 26 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. The figures are not clearly establish its denominator so it is confusing.
2. What does the author mean by institutional learning vs commercial e-learning packages.
3. In the method section the author noted that the quantitative data would be presented as mean, SD but through the result there is not even one instance of it.
4. Language edit is required.
5. After the modification based on above comments it can be published.
You did not explain how to develop the questionnaire.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Sep 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 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 (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.

We would like to thank reviewers and editorial team for their observations on our manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

Minor revision

1. The figures are not clearly establish its denominator so it is confusing.

We have added denominator in the text in the methodology section,highlighted with red font colour.

In the tables the denominators are mentioned as total, the total varied in tables as per the responses of the participants. As we have mentioned total in the tables, we have not specifically mentioned in the description of the tables as it will lead to repetition of the data.

2. What does the author mean by institutional e learning vs commercial e learning packages

The commercial e learning packages are the online classes by some of the coaching institutes which helps students learn the core syllabus of the course as well as prepare students for entrance exams. These are paid versions and may be free in initial promotion time for advertising/ marketing.

The institutional e -learning is considered here- online teaching learning of syllabus through Learning management system, live classes through various platforms(ZOOM,Google meet etc.) or using google classroom which is organised by respective health science institutions.

3. In the method section the author noted that the quantitative data would be presented as mean, SD but through the result there is not even one instance of it

Ans 3 Age of the study participants has been presented in the form of mean (SD). It has been mentioned under result and discussion sections.it has been highlighted with red font colour.

4. Language edit is required

Thorough language revision is done; highlighted yellow.

5. After the modification based on above comments it can be published

All modifications are done as per reviewers' suggestions.

You did not explain how to develop the questionnaire

It is mentioned in the third paragraph of material and methods. The questions are also highlighted in the tables and their respective results are mentioned.

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) 7 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** (2) 7 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The requested corrections, except for one case, should be included in parentheses in the definition of commercial and institutional e-packages.
I think it can be published after this correction.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 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.