Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 3 · Issue 3 · e162451

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Clinical Education Quality and Its Influencing Factors from the Perspective of Medical Students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, 2023

Ali Sotoudeh, Sasan Ghorbani, Atefeh Zahedi, Mohammad Mahboubi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Nov 2024	27 Jan 2025	27 Jan 2025	10.5812/chbs-162451

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, Bagher Pahlavanzadeh, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

4 comments · 8 May 2025 – 26 May 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 8 May 2025

1. Is the article within the scope of the journal?
o It appears the article is within the scope of the "Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies" journal, as it deals with an important aspect of health education (clinical education) and involves biomedical sciences (medical students).
2. Does the article have novelty?
o The article investigates the quality of clinical education at a specific university (Abadan University of Medical Sciences) and identifies influencing factors from the students' perspective. This provides specific institutional insight, which can be considered novel, especially if this specific assessment hasn't been previously published.
Title
3. Does the title reflect the content appropriately?
o Yes, the title accurately reflects the content. It clearly states the subject (clinical education quality), the influencing factors, the target population (medical students), and the setting (Abadan University of Medical Sciences).
4. Is there any abbreviation in the title?
o No, there are no abbreviations in the title.
Abstract
5. Is there a structured Abstract?
o Yes, the abstract is structured with clear sections: Background, Objectives, Materials and Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
Introduction
7. Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)
o The objective is clearly stated in the abstract and introduction: "To this end, the present study was conducted to assess the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences in the year 2023".
8. Does the Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”?
o What we know: The introduction discusses the importance of clinical education in medical training and factors that influence its quality, referencing previous studies.
o What we don’t know: The introduction implies a gap in knowledge regarding the specific quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which justifies the study.
o Aims: The aim is clearly stated as investigating the factors affecting the quality of clinical education for medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences.
Materials and Methods
9. Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?
o The study participants were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences who had entered the clinical setting (entry years 2017-2020). There were no control groups in this study design.
10. Study Design Described Sufficiently?
o The study design is described as a descriptive-cross-sectional study. The design is appropriate for assessing the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at a specific point in time.
11. Adequacy of the sample studied?
o The sample size was determined to be 94 individuals based on similar studies, with a 10% nonresponse rate, and the researcher surveyed 98 individuals. The justification for the sample size is provided.

12. Subjects Representative of Target Population?
o The subjects were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which is the target population. Convenience sampling was used. The representativeness might be limited by the convenience sampling method.
13. Provided sample size calculation or justification?
o Yes, the sample size calculation is mentioned.
14. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?
o Yes, the inclusion criteria (being a medical student, being in a clinical department, and providing consent) and the exclusion criterion (failing to answer more than 10% of the questionnaire questions) are clearly explained.
15. Appropriate Statistical Analysis?
o The statistical analysis methods (independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA) appear to be appropriate for the type of data and research questions.
Results
16. Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables?
o The tables are appropriate and clearly present the data.
17. Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?
o The results are presented in a logical sequence, starting with the demographic characteristics of the participants and then presenting the findings related to the quality of clinical education and its domains.
Discussion
18. Conclusion justified & substantiated?
o The conclusions are generally justified by the results. The discussion also acknowledges limitations and compares the findings with previous research.
19. Analysis supports Conclusion?
o The analysis appears to support the conclusions. The study identifies areas for improvement in clinical education based on the students' perceptions.

The manuscript is suitable for publication with revisions.
Recommendations for Revision:
• Verify MeSH Keywords: The authors should verify that their keywords are MeSH terms and state this in the manuscript.
• Remove Repetitive Information: The repeated ethical statements should be removed to make the manuscript more concise.

Bagher Pahlavanzadeh Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 May 2025

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I have provided detailed comments and suggestions in the uploaded file, addressing various aspects of the paper, including the abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion.
Please refer to the uploaded file for a comprehensive list of my feedback. I believe addressing these points will improve the overall quality of the manuscript and help the authors strengthen their research.

good luck

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 26 May 2025

Public Comment:
1. Is the article within the scope of the journal?
o It appears the article is within the scope of the "Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies" journal, as it deals with an important aspect of health education (clinical education) and involves biomedical sciences (medical students).
2. Does the article have novelty?
o The article investigates the quality of clinical education at a specific university (Abadan University of Medical Sciences) and identifies influencing factors from the students' perspective. This provides specific institutional insight, which can be considered novel, especially if this specific assessment hasn't been previously published.
Title
3. Does the title reflect the content appropriately?
o Yes, the title accurately reflects the content. It clearly states the subject (clinical education quality), the influencing factors, the target population (medical students), and the setting (Abadan University of Medical Sciences).
4. Is there any abbreviation in the title?
o No, there are no abbreviations in the title.
Abstract
5. Is there a structured Abstract?
o Yes, the abstract is structured with clear sections: Background, Objectives, Materials and Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
Introduction
7. Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)
o The objective is clearly stated in the abstract and introduction: "To this end, the present study was conducted to assess the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences in the year 2023".
8. Does the Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”?
o What we know: The introduction discusses the importance of clinical education in medical training and factors that influence its quality, referencing previous studies.
o What we don’t know: The introduction implies a gap in knowledge regarding the specific quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which justifies the study.
o Aims: The aim is clearly stated as investigating the factors affecting the quality of clinical education for medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences.
Materials and Methods
9. Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?
o The study participants were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences who had entered the clinical setting (entry years 2017-2020). There were no control groups in this study design.
10. Study Design Described Sufficiently?
o The study design is described as a descriptive-cross-sectional study. The design is appropriate for assessing the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at a specific point in time.
11. Adequacy of the sample studied?
o The sample size was determined to be 94 individuals based on similar studies, with a 10% nonresponse rate, and the researcher surveyed 98 individuals. The justification for the sample size is provided.
12. Subjects Representative of Target Population?
o The subjects were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which is the target population. Convenience sampling was used. The representativeness might be limited by the convenience

sampling method.
13. Provided sample size calculation or justification?
o Yes, the sample size calculation is mentioned.
14. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?
o Yes, the inclusion criteria (being a medical student, being in a clinical department, and providing consent) and the exclusion criterion (failing to answer more than 10% of the questionnaire questions) are clearly explained.
15. Appropriate Statistical Analysis?
o The statistical analysis methods (independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA) appear to be appropriate for the type of data and research questions.
Results
16. Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables?
o The tables are appropriate and clearly present the data.
17. Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?
o The results are presented in a logical sequence, starting with the demographic characteristics of the participants and then presenting the findings related to the quality of clinical education and its domains.
Discussion
18. Conclusion justified & substantiated?
o The conclusions are generally justified by the results. The discussion also acknowledges limitations and compares the findings with previous research.
19. Analysis supports Conclusion?
o The analysis appears to support the conclusions. The study identifies areas for improvement in clinical education based on the students' perceptions.
The manuscript is suitable for publication with revisions.
Recommendations for Revision:
• Verify MeSH Keywords: The authors should verify that their keywords are MeSH terms and state this in the manuscript.
• Remove Repetitive Information: The repeated ethical statements should be removed to make the manuscript more concise.

Decision:
Minor revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 26 May 2025

Public Comment:
1. Is the article within the scope of the journal?
o It appears the article is within the scope of the "Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies" journal, as it deals with an important aspect of health education (clinical education) and involves biomedical sciences (medical students).
2. Does the article have novelty?
o The article investigates the quality of clinical education at a specific university (Abadan University of Medical Sciences) and identifies influencing factors from the students' perspective. This provides specific institutional insight, which can be considered novel, especially if this specific assessment hasn't been previously published.
Title

3. Does the title reflect the content appropriately?
0 Yes, the title accurately reflects the content. It clearly states the subject (clinical education quality), the influencing factors, the target population (medical students), and the setting (Abadan University of Medical Sciences).
4. Is there any abbreviation in the title?
0 No, there are no abbreviations in the title.
Abstract
5. Is there a structured Abstract?
0 Yes, the abstract is structured with clear sections: Background, Objectives, Materials and Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
Introduction
7. Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)
0 The objective is clearly stated in the abstract and introduction: "To this end, the present study was conducted to assess the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences in the year 2023".
8. Does the Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”?
0 What we know: The introduction discusses the importance of clinical education in medical training and factors that influence its quality, referencing previous studies.
0 What we don’t know: The introduction implies a gap in knowledge regarding the specific quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which justifies the study.
0 Aims: The aim is clearly stated as investigating the factors affecting the quality of clinical education for medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences.
Materials and Methods
9. Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?
0 The study participants were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences who had entered the clinical setting (entry years 2017-2020). There were no control groups in this study design.
10. Study Design Described Sufficiently?
0 The study design is described as a descriptive-cross-sectional study. The design is appropriate for assessing the quality of clinical education and its influencing factors at a specific point in time.
11. Adequacy of the sample studied?
0 The sample size was determined to be 94 individuals based on similar studies, with a 10% non-response rate, and the researcher surveyed 98 individuals. The justification for the sample size is provided.
12. Subjects Representative of Target Population?
0 The subjects were medical students at Abadan University of Medical Sciences, which is the target population. Convenience sampling was used. The representativeness might be limited by the convenience sampling method.
13. Provided sample size calculation or justification?
0 Yes, the sample size calculation is mentioned.
14. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?
0 Yes, the inclusion criteria (being a medical student, being in a clinical department, and providing consent) and the exclusion criterion (failing to answer more than 10% of the questionnaire questions) are clearly explained.
15. Appropriate Statistical Analysis?
0 The statistical analysis methods (independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA) appear to be appropriate for the type of data and research questions.
Results

16. Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables?
o The tables are appropriate and clearly present the data.
17. Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?
o The results are presented in a logical sequence, starting with the demographic characteristics of the participants and then presenting the findings related to the quality of clinical education and its domains.
Discussion
18. Conclusion justified & substantiated?
o The conclusions are generally justified by the results. The discussion also acknowledges limitations and compares the findings with previous research.
19. Analysis supports Conclusion?
o The analysis appears to support the conclusions. The study identifies areas for improvement in clinical education based on the students' perceptions.
The manuscript is suitable for publication with revisions.
Recommendations for Revision:
• Verify MeSH Keywords: The authors should verify that their keywords are MeSH terms and state this in the manuscript.
• Remove Repetitive Information: The repeated ethical statements should be removed to make the manuscript more concise.

Decision:
Minor revision

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 Reviewers

While thanking the reviewers for their detailed comments, the following points are answered below:

Reviewer 1&2:

1. *The authors should verify that their keywords are MeSH terms and state this in the manuscript.* ***Done***
2. *The repeated ethical statements should be removed to make the manuscript more concise.* ***Done***

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 16 Jul 2025

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Jul 2025

Accept