Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 20 · Issue 4 · e114945

OPEN PEER REVIEW

"Must Love Rock Climbing?" Emergency Medicine Applicants' Hobbies from Two Academic Institutions

Benjamin Holden Schnapp, Justin Purnell, Kevin McConkey

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
3 Apr 2021	12 Dec 2021	26 Jan 2022	10.5812/jme.114945

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

1 comment · 1 Dec 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 1 Dec 2021

No comment.

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.

Must Love Rock Climbing? Emergency Medicine Applicants' Hobbies from Two Academic Institutions.

The title of the article is groundbreaking in the country & around the worldwide

According to the author's guide on the Journal's site: Corresponds.

The methodology is consistent with the type of article.

The number of words corresponds to the article type.

Article Review Criteria:

Introduction:

At the background section, it is necessary to explain the importance and impact of assessment hobbies of emergency medicine residents.

Thank you for this comment- we have added the association of hobbies with decreased burnout in residents to the first paragraph of the Introduction

How do the personalities of emergency medicine residents relate to their hobbies? What is the importance of exploring hobbies and their interests in their professional future?

The authors appreciate this comment; a line has been added to the Introduction clarifying the connection between the EM personality and what it suggests about their potential hobbies.

How does knowing the hobbies of emergency medicine residents help the residency training program?

We appreciate this suggestion – the first addition noted addresses this point, and we have added an additional line to the Conclusions suggesting the possibility that programs may benefit from selecting applicants who can participate in their hobbies during residency.

You mentioned in the introduction & background "No previous work has sought to verify whether EM applicants uniquely list hobbies that align with the EM "personality" By reading the methodology, you do not seem to have a tool for examining people's personality, which you have used to examine the relationship between personality style and the interests and hobbies of residents.

Thank you for this comment – the reference to personality has been deleted from this sentence and replaced with "stereotype," which better reflects the content of the manuscript.

The purpose you have given does not match the final sentence of your problem statement.

Thank you – please see above comment, they should now align.

Method & methodology:

In the methodology section Explain how to access the electronic Residency Application Service.

The web address for the ERAS program has been added to the Methods.

Didn't you explain the plastic surgery, Psychiatry and emergency medicine residency program? Do these two training programs (plastic surgery & Psychiatry) have in common that they have been selected for comparison with emergency medicine residents?

Thank you, a sentence has been added explaining that these specialties were chosen as they each had strong stereotypes that differed sharply from the EM stereotype.

Did you not have inclusion and exclusion criteria for the participants in this study? Have you selected all the students of these universities by census method?

Thank you, a sentence was added clarifying that there were no specific exclusion criteria and that all applicants to the two programs were eligible for inclusion.

Mention the code of ethics of the research proposal.

Thank you - as stated in the last sentence of the Methods, the project was determined to be exempt quality improvement by the UW School of Medicine and Public Health Institutional Review Board; as such it was conducted according to commonly accepted ethical guidelines for research. Given this, we do not generally select and report a specific code of ethics.

No explanation is given regarding the coding process of the collected data. Did you have a meaning unit? Are the codes derived from meaning units?

Or selected a code according to the number of repetitions of each word in the text.

We appreciate this question - the coding process is described on Line 77 – two EM residents individually examined each listed hobby to determine the category of best fit. The hobby categories were chosen based on previously published hobby categories (Line 80). A word frequency analysis was not performed due to concerns about missed nuance as described on Line 75.

What have you done trustworthiness criteria for the generated code? Is only pear checking done? What is about Member Checking??

Thank you for this inquiry - the Cohen's kappa for agreement between raters is strong (0.92), suggesting the categorizations are trustworthy. As described on Line 83, only peer checking was done as there was no gold standard available for comparison; a line further explaining this was added to Line 85. It was not possible to crosscheck the categorizations with the applicants themselves as all the data was deidentified.

Discussion:

In discussing and concluding, you should compare the results of your study with the results of similar studies. But this is not well seen in the text of the article.

The authors appreciate this suggestion and have added more contextualizing literature at the end of the Discussion.

Conclusion:

The last sentence does not contain a suggestion to other researchers. At the end of the discussion, you should make suggestions for future research based on the findings of your study.

Thank you – ideas for further potential studies were moved to the end of the Conclusions as suggested

.

Overall Evaluation:

Accept with minor Revision and further review

.We appreciate the thoughtful review and helpful critiques of the Reviewer

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.