Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 23 · Issue 3 · e116611

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Biostatistics Graduates' Perspectives Concerning the Curriculum, the Course Educational Topics, and Its Association with Their Career-related Requirements

Mohammadreza Balooch Hasankhani, Masoud Roudbari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 Jun 2021	12 Sep 2021	24 Sep 2021	10.5812/semj.116611

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** Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

1 comment · 10 Jul 2021

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jul 2021

The paper must be rewritten because the incoherence of the text is obvious. Based on the reviewers' comments, rewrite the manuscript and resubmit it.

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.

July 19, 2021

Submission ID: 116611

Title: "***The Biostatistics graduates' Perspectives concerning the curriculum, the course educational topics, and its association with their career- related requirements***"

Dear Dr. Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Editorial of Shiraz E-Medical Journal

We would like to thank you and the reviewer for the valuable comments which help us to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Hereby, it should be noted that we read the comments carefully and revised the manuscript accordingly. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1

Introduction

Response to comments

Comment 1. It is important to give the readers more detailed information in terms of background. For example, in Paragraph 3, the authors didn't describe the possible strengths and drawbacks of curriculum planning in this field. In Lines 58-62, the authors should cite some other studies.

Authors: Thanks. We add some new articles together with the strengths and drawbacks of the study.

Comment 2. There was no consistency between the objective of the study and the presented results. For example, in Paragraph 4 Line 65, the authors aimed to evaluate the viewpoints of biostatistics graduates about using their ability and their skills in requirements of the public. However, there was no comparison between them in the results section. I think that the authors should mention this feature and report it in the results section.

Authors: Thanks to the reviewer. The authors asked a question (Have the content of the Field of Study met job requirements) from the participant and the result of this question summarized in line 118 to 120. We added comparison between disciplines in Figure2

Comment 3. The sentences in Lines 67 to 73 are vague and unscientific. Proper planning and training of skilled graduates can be considered as a necessary condition but it is not enough. I would like the authors to address these points and cite proper references to address the points.

Authors: Many thanks. The line of 67 to 73 were changed.

Method

Comment 4. The authors didn't mention information about the items or scales of the questionnaire (number of items or dimensions of the questionnaire, scoring criteria, …)

Authors. Thanks a lot. We changed the second paragraph of method section according to reviewers' comments

Comment 5. The authors must report more psychometric properties of the questionnaire like reliability, internal consistency, and other validity (such as construct validity) of the questionnaire.

Authors: Many thanks. we have done the requested changed in methods section.

Comment 6. The sampling method and data gathering were not clear (How did the authors select subjects from each university)?

Authors: Thanks. We added the response in line 80-84. Also we did not use sampling and all the graduated took part in the study.

Comment 7. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were general. The authors did not explain the graduates' employment status. It is not clear whether the subjects work according to their major or their degree? I think the authors should consider some other criteria and answer these questions:

Where do the participants work after graduation?

Do they work in the same workplace or have the same job?

Subjects could be classified according to their job or where they currently work.

Authors: Thanks, the Inclusion and exclusion criteria were modified, and the answers to the questions of the esteemed reviewer were added in the results section (Results section, after Figure 2). Also, some of graduates (faculty members with PhD degree) normally work according to their majors, but the other work according to their degree. We hope the comments met the reviewer's question

Results

Comment 8. The result of Table 2 showed that 57.1% and 43.5% of subjects have met job requirements. It is not clear to us how the results obtained? It is important to explain how the "Content of the Field of Study" measure?

Authors: Thank you again. The table (Figure) revised to meet reviewer's comment. Also, it is necessary to add that the content of table 2, came from a question from the employed graduates in our questionnaire (have the content of the field of study met your job requirements) with two choice of (yes & no), therefore, the table is the result of this question. Also, we changed the table with Figure as requested.

Comment 9. Authors could show the results by drawing a Figure instead of Tables to present clear and concise results.

Authors: Thanks again. We changed the table to figure to meet the reviewer's comment, although tables are as clear as the figures

Comment 10. A thesis or seminar is a course that practically helps students to acquire the necessary skills in a particular subject. The dissertation takes into consideration an important feature in the master's and Ph.D. courses at all universities or academic centers. It does not seem appropriate to compare them with other courses.

Authors: Thank a lot. The changes were applied in table 1 & 2.

Comment 11. The authors should explain if the current study was the first that has been done in the field of Biostatistics?

Authors: Thanks. We add a paragraph at the end of introduction section to explain the reviewer's request**s.**

Discussion

Comment 12. The results showed that less than 50% of graduates declared that the course contents had met their job requirements. Therefore, Paragraph 1; Lines 156 to 158 should be revised. I think that it is important to underline the results of the study.

Authors: Thank you for your comment. We changed discussion according to reviewer's comments.

Comment 13. Another concept that could be considered in the discussion section is the comparison between the results of the current study with the previous ones. Conclusions should be cited base on scientific researches. Could the author add some comments on this issue?

Authors: Thanks. We used 6 articles to compare the result of the current study with previous one.

Reviewer 2

Response to comments

Comment 14. It is suggested that the results of statistical tests be given in the table.

Authors: Thanks. Since all of statistical tests were not significant, therefore, the results did not introduce in tables, and only appeared in the text.

Comment 15. Report the p-value in text.

Authors: Thanks again. Since all used statistical tests where not significant, p-values were not introduced

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

September 12, 2021

Submission ID: 116611

Title: "***The Biostatistics graduates' Perspectives concerning the curriculum, the course educational topics, and its association with their career- related requirements***"

Dear Dr. Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Editor of Chief, Shiraz E-Medical Journal

We would like to thank you and the respected reviewer for the valuable comments which help us to improve the manuscript.

Hereby, it should be noted that we read the comments carefully and revised the manuscript accordingly. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1

Response to comments

Comment 1. The authors must consider the formatting style for manuscripts and modify the structure of the "Introduction" section accordingly.

Authors: Thank, we changed the format of the background section and hope to be satisfied.

Comment 2. The authors didn't answer comment 5. They should report the reliability of the questionnaire.

Authors: Thanks again. The reliability of the questionnaires add to method section as requested.

Comment 3. The P-values need to be reported.

Authors: Many thanks. The P-values add to method section of the manuscript.

Comment 4. The manuscript needs to be edited by an English-speaking native.

Authors. Thanks a lot. We edited the manuscript again, and also it was reviewed by a Englisg specialist. Hope it satisfies now.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.