Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 22 · Issue 1 · e123083

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Factors Affecting Learning Essential Procedural Skills in Pediatric Residents: A Cross-sectional Study

Soleiman Ahmady, Bahareh Abshari, Amin Habibi, Masomeh Kalantarion

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
30 Jan 2022	15 Jul 2023	2 Sep 2023	10.5812/jme-123083

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 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 Referee 1 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Dear Dr Sareh Shakerian,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript, and for the helpful feedback provided by you and the three reviewers. In response to this feedback, we have made a number of revisions to the original manuscript and attach a detailed description of these. We hope that we have addressed satisfactorily the issues raised, however, we are happy to make further amendments as necessary.

Reviewer 1:

Thank you to reviewer one for their positive comments about the paper.

Reviewer comment:1. Some sentences need to be corrected in terms of grammar.

We amended the article based on your comment.

Reviewer comment:2. The results section is explained very vaguely in the abstract. In a way that it is difficult to understand even after reading it several times. Please write in a clearer way.

We revised the abstract of the article according to your comment.

Reviewer comment:3. In the methods section in the abstract, there is no name or no mention of the type of tools used (questionnaire used).

We revised the methods section in the abstract of the article according to your comment.

Reviewer comment:4. In the introduction, you have defined clinical teaching over and over again, which does not need to be repeated.

Based on your comment, we have omitted some repeated contents.

Reviewer comment:5. The introduction is very long and does not require repetitive and additional explanations. Please provide an integrated introduction.

Based on your comment, we have omitted some text in introduction.

Reviewer comment: 6. The MeSH words are not used in keywords except in one case.

We have changed MeSH words as requested.

Reviewer comment:7. According to the title of the manuscript, your goal is procedural skills, which is different from clinical skills. It is better to use the right phrase and emphasize your explanations in the introduction on procedural skills, not clinical skills.

We have changed all of the clinical skills to procedural skills all over the article.

Reviewer comment:8. Is it possible to explain the novelty? Would the author please clarify the novelty of the study?

Based on your comment, we have added some text at end of the introduction to show novelty in our study.

Reviewer comment:9. How was the sample size calculated and according to which similar study was the sample size estimated?

Since convenience sampling method was used, all pediatric residents were included in the study in 2019.

Reviewer comment:10. In the results section, only the expression of the results is required. There is no need to make suggestions in lines No. 181 and 185.

We have amended the result according to your comments

Reviewer comment:11. It is not necessary to mention the names of previous studies in the discussion, and only mentioning the name of the author and the year of publication of the study is sufficient.

Based on your comment, we have revised discussion.

Yours sincerely,

Amin Habibi

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 4 Dec 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 Dec 2022

Abstract:
In the introduction, instead of general explanations about clinical education, it is better to explain the meaning of essential procedural skills learning, what kinds of skills are meant, and whether these skills differ according to the resident's academic year.
Please consider the resident's academic year in the results section.
The keywords should be more specific and representative of the work. All three keywords are general and do not describe the research.
Introduction:
The same problems found in the introduction of the abstract are also present in the introduction of the main text. The meaning of essential procedural skills learning is not explained according to the academic year of the resident.
What are the findings of research conducted at other universities in the country and around the world?
Methods:
Explain the method used to determine validity.
Discussion:
Comparison with other studies should be accompanied by analysis and interpretation. This interpretation is not provided in the discussion.

3

Revision 2

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.

Dear Dr Sareh Shakerian,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript, and for the helpful feedback provided by you and the three reviewers. In response to this feedback, we have made a number of revisions to the original manuscript and attach a detailed description of these. We hope that we have addressed satisfactorily the issues raised, however, we are happy to make further amendments as necessary.

Reviewer 1:

Thank you to reviewer one for their positive comments about the paper.

Reviewer comment: Abstract: In the introduction, instead of general explanations about clinical education, it is better to explain the meaning of essential procedural skills learning, what kind of skills is meant and whether these skills differ according to the resident's academic year or not?

We revised the abstract of the article according to your comment.

Reviewer comment: Please consider resident academic year in the results section.

We added resident academic year in result.

Reviewer comment: The keywords should be more specific and representative of the work. All three keywords are general and do not introduce research.

We amended the article based on your comment.

Reviewer comment: Introduction: Exactly the problems found in the introduction of the summary of the article are also present in the introduction of main text. The meaning of essential procedural skills learning is not explained according to the academic year of the resident.

We revised the introduction of the article according to your comment.

Reviewer comment: What are the research results of researchers in other universities in the country and in the world?

We added the research results of researchers in other universities in introduction.

Reviewer comment: Methods: Explain the validity determination method.

Based on your comment, we have added some text at end of the method to explain more validity.

Reviewer comment: Discussion: Comparison with other studies should be accompanied by analysis and interpretation. This interpretation is not done in the discussion

We have amended the discussion according to your comments

Yours sincerely,

Amin Habibi

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 26 Jul 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Jul 2023

Abstract:
Modifications of the Abstract and keywords are acceptable.
Introduction:
Modifications of the Introduction are acceptable.
Results:
Modifications of the results are acceptable.
Discussion:
Modifications of the discussion are acceptable.