Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 23 · Issue 1 · e143114

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Examining the Status of Competency-Oriented in Medical Science Education in Iran

Mahnaz Fatemi Aqda, Javad Hatami, Soleiman Ahmady, Ebrahim Talaee

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Dec 2023	13 Jan 2024	21 Jan 2024	10.5812/jme-143114

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 · 5 Jan 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 5 Jan 2024

A comment has been placed in the manuscript file.

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.

With greetings, courtesy and respect
:and thanks to the dear reviewers
The items were studied one by one and addressed, and they are highlighted in
.the article

.The corrections were made in the main article -1

This study is a two-phase applied study that consists of two phases

-2

.It was stated in the article

The data of the research synthesis part were collected and analyzed with the scoping review method (scop review) and using the Arksey and .O'Malley framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005)

D ocum ent code	Docum ent details (book, article)	Selected text (collected)	Condensation while preserving the core meaning (summary)	C ategorizati on	T hemes
1					
2					

Analysis of the focus group discussion part was based on the Graneheim and Lundman model [4], including determining meaning units, summarizing and condensing meaning units, categorization and creation of themes. A sample of the model table and the researcher-made table based on the model can be seen below

Determ ining meanin g units	Summarizing and condensing meaning units	Creating categories	Creating themes (theme)

Code	Interview text (collected)	Condensation while preserving the core meaning (summary)	Categorization	Themes
1				
2				

A superficial search was performed in ERIC, but mostly because, for free access to the data of each database, a lot of time would have had to be spent registering in that database. By registering on the Yabesh website, the large databases that this site made available were used. -3

A4: Done.

A to Q5. The choice of this time range was in order to use more recent research, because it is assumed that medical sciences education has undergone many changes and advances in recent years that may have transformed its quality.

With the scoping review performed (in order to use all articles that met the inclusion criteria) -6

Corrected. -7

Corrected (qualitative-analytical method with two steps: research synthesis and qualitative content analysis) -8

Purposive method: -9

Documents: the whole-collection method (Collection Complete) or criterion-based

(Sampling Criterion)

Sampling of individuals:

Purposive sampling of special cases (snowball) is a method in which samples, because of

the extraordinary importance they have, and [because] they are at the center of the subject under study, are selected.

Data [collection] was performed through focus group discussion, and during the discussion we reached data saturation, that is, the point where the data became repetitive. -10

Focus group discussion, 11-.

To achieve the highest accuracy, a second reviewer [coder] and a review of the interview with one of the participants were used. -12

-13 Write the title above their tables (done)
.14 Done.
-15 Done.
-16 Done.
-17 Done.
- 18 Done.
With thanks and
Respectfully, the authors of the article 1

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.