Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 25 · Issue 7 · e142395

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating Factors Affecting the Acceptance of E-Learning among Faculty Members and Students of Macro Medical Universities in Region Three Based on the Davis Model: A Cross-Sectional Study

Mohammad Rasool Khazaei, Azam Norouzi, Eshagh Moradi, Maryam Shahabi, Sadra Haji, Azizeh Barry, Masoumeh Shohani, Mohammad Hasan Keshavarzi, Akram Zhianifard, Babak Paknia, Ghobad Ramezani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
1 Nov 2023	21 Apr 2024	30 Apr 2024	10.5812/semj-142395

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 6
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Associate Editor 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 15
5 **Revision 4** Associate Editor 16
Authors' reply to reviewers 17
Reviewer and editor comments 18
6 **Revision 5** 19
Authors' reply to reviewers 20
Reviewer and editor comments 21

1 Original submission

1 comment · 20 Dec 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 20 Dec 2023

Title:
1- I recommend adding ": A Cross-Sectional Study" to the title.
Abstract:
2- Using cross-sectional study is better than using descriptive. Please change it here and throughout the manuscript.
Introduction:
3- In this part, we need the results of previous studies.
Methods:
4- Please explain the Persian form of the tool, its validity and reliability, and possible translation and back-translation.
5- The setting is not clear enough. The location, relevant dates, recruitment periods, and data collection details are missing from the Methods section.
6- Eligibility criteria, details of participants, and details of selection should be added to this part.
7- What was your plan for minimizing nonresponse?
8- How did you compare the groups (teachers and students)?
9- Is there any source of bias in your study?
10- Please provide the formula for estimating sample size.
11- Explain how missing data were addressed.
12- I think that using simple random sampling is not appropriate for this broad context.
Results:
13- Please report the number of participants at different stages, such as potentially eligible, confirmed, included, excluded, and analyzed. Using a flowchart with explanations of the reasons is helpful.
Discussion:
14- In the first paragraph, please link your key results to the objectives of the study.
15- Is there any study that is not in line with the findings of the present study?
16- Please rewrite the conclusion section. It has some typos and is not clear.
17- Please add limitations.
18- Please discuss the generalizability of the results.

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.

Response to reviewers:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Please revise "inferential (t, regression)" in the abstract. It was reviewed. Page 1. Abstract

2. Please remove: According to the above documents and the notification of the comprehensive program of justice, excellence, and efficiency in medical science education to all universities under consideration, the emphasis of one of the important working groups of this program is on the development of new technologies in the promotion of education and learning. Conducting preliminary studies to understand the existing situation and also explaining the influencing. Deleted. Page 1. Abstract

3. The questionnaire has 21 questions or 25? It was reviewed. Page 1. Abstract, line 9

4. The time of the study is not clear. Done, in the year 2023. *Page 1. Abstract, line 7*

5. Please report the CVI and CVR of the tool with reference. Done,. Page 3., line 32-42

6. Estimate the sample size based on the main aim. Done,. Page 4., line 8-9

7. Please revise "laser software". Done,. Page 1. Abstract, line 16

8. Revise all of the "above table". Done

9. Revise "the gender variable of the research sample". Done

10. Describe the results of each table, before it. Done

11. Merge Tables 2 and 3. This was not possible because the contents of the two tables were different

12. In Table 3, report exact P-values. Done

13. Use correlation instead of relationship. Done

14. Revise the title of Table 4. Done

15. Show the related information of Table 4 in a diagram. Done

16. Revise "which is significant at the 0.01 level" as "P<0.001". Done

17. Revise "suitability" in Table 5. Done

18. Revise "Standard index". Done

19. NFI, NNFI, CF, RFI and IF must be greater than 0.9 or less than 0.9? Done

20. The results presentation is poor. Done

Associate Editor 1:

Title:

1- I recommend to add ": A Cross-Sectional Study" to title Done

Abstract:

2- Using cross sectional study is better than descriptive. Please change it here and all over the manuscript. Done

Introduction:

3- In this part we need the results of previous works. Done

Methods:

4- Please explain about the Persian form of the tool and its validity and reliability and probable translation and back-translation. Done

5- Setting is not clear enough. location, relevant dates, periods of recruitment, data collection details are missing in the method part. Done
6- eligibility criteria, details of participants and details of selection should be add to this part. Done
7- What was your plan for minimizing non-response? Done
8- How you compare groups (teachers and students)? Done
9- Is there any source of bias in your study? Done
10- Please bring the formula of estimating sample size. Done
11- Explain how missing data were addressed. Done
12- I think that using simple random sampling is not appropriate for this broad context. Done
Results:
13- Please report the number of participants in different stages such as potentially eligible, confirmed, included, excluded and analysed. Using a flowchart whit explanation of reasons is helpful. Done
Discussion:
14- In the first paragraph please join your key results to the objectives of the study. Done
15- Is there any study which is not inline with the findings of the present study? Done
16- Please rewrite the conclusion part. it has some typos and is not clear. Done
17- please add limitations. Done
18- please discuss generalisability of the results. Done

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.

Response to reviewers:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. *Estimate the sample size based on the main aim.* *Done,. Page 4., line 2-9*
   2. Revise all of the "above table". *All the tables were checked once and edited wherever needed.*
   3. Revise "the gender variable of the research sample". *The gender variable of the sample was modified.*
   4. In Table 3, report exact P-values for all of the correlations. *In Table 3, exact P values for all correlations are reported.*
   5. Use correlation instead of relationship. *In all the text and tables, the word correlation was used instead of relationship.*
   6. Revise "below diagram". *The graph was checked again, the output was not different.*

   7. NFI, NNFI, CF, RFI and IF must be greater than 0.9 or less than 0.9?
   8. The RMSE must be >0.01!?

1. *Model fit indices (NFI, NNFI, CF, RFI and IF) should be equal to or greater than 0.9 based on relevant and valid references, including:*
2. *Bagh Khasti, F., Niaz Azari, K., & Jabari, N. (2020). Provide a genuine leadership model in the major universities of medical sciences in Region One. Educational researches, 15(64), 1-26.*
3. *Heydari S, Barzegar M, Mohammad Davoudi AH. Analyzing the Factor Structure of the Scale "Evaluation of Cyber Security Culture and Awareness" (Case study: Employees of Bank branches in Ahvaz City): Journal of Psychological Methods and Models 2023; 14 (51): 113-126.*
4. *Razavi, S. A., & Mohammadali Tajrishi, I. (2022). Designing a Model for Risk Management and Energy Insurance in the Upstream Part of the Iranian Petroleum Industry. Economics and Regional Development Journal, 29(2): 30-54. (in Persian with English abstract)*

Associate Editor 1:
Associate Editor 1:
Unfortunately the respected author(s) have not corrected the manuscript based on my 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17. 18.

5- Setting is not clear enough. location, relevant dates, periods of recruitment, data collection details are missing in the method part. The place and date of study is specified in the text. It is a highlight. It has been avoided to mention other details because it was not related to technology and its acceptance. Page 3.

6- eligibility criteria, details of participants and details of selection should be add to this part. Inclusion criteria were added. Page 4. Liner 10-11

7- What was your plan for minimizing non-response? In the students' section, we used a high sample size for the possible sample drop. On behalf of the vice-chancellor of the university, we also made several follow-ups.

8- How you compare groups (teachers and students)? by the test of two independent groups

9- Is there any source of bias in your study? As much as possible, there was no source of bias in the study

10- Please bring the formula of estimating sample size. Cochran's formula was used. Page 4 is the highlight

11- Explain how missing data were addressed. with strong statistical tests. But no specific data was lost

13- Please report the number of participants in different stages such as potentially eligible, confirmed, included, excluded and analysed. Using a flowchart whit explanation of reasons is helpful. This was not a quasi-experimental study that required Fouchart. We mentioned the statistical population, sampling method and sample size in both professor and student sections.

Discussion:

15- Is there any study which is not inline with the findings of the present study? Yes, including the study of Khorasani et al. Reference 10

17- please add limitations. Restrictions added. Page 8

18- please discuss generalisability of the results? Done, Page 9

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 18 Feb 2024

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 18 Feb 2024

Dear author(s)
Before I can accept this manuscript, I need you to fully address my comments and clearly highlight the corresponding changes in the manuscript, as follows:
Comment no.5: Your response is not acceptable. You should explain the setting in detail.
Comments no.7,8,9: It is not enough to explain the issue to the reviewer; you should add this explanation to the manuscript as well.
Comment no.13: Flowcharts are not only for trials; they can be used for clarification anywhere.
Comments no. 15,17,18: The corresponding changes are not highlighted in the manuscript.
Thank you

4

Revision 3

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.

Response to reviewers:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. *Please remove all of the information about the sample size calculation.*
   It was removed in the abstract and only the number was added in the statistical population section.
   It was removed in the methods section in page 4T, line 5 and only the number was added in the statistical population section.

2. *Revise all of the "above table".*
   Titles in table 1 to 5 were modified.
   Page 4, table 1 & 2
   Page 5, table 3 & 4
   Page 6, table 5
   the above table was changed to the below table
3. *Revise "the gender variable of the research sample".*
   The first line of the results section and the title of table one were modified
4. *In Table 3, report exact P-values for all of the correlations. For example, r=0.50 (P<0.001).*
   Done; the P-values were reported.
5. *Revise "below diagram".Done in page 6*
6. *NFI, NNFI, CF, RFI and IF must be greater than 0.9 or less than 0.9?*
   It was modified in Table 5
7. *The RMSE must be >0.01!?*
   For the fit indices, according to all sources and references, the standard value of these indices () must be equal to or greater than 0.09 for the model to be considered to have acceptable validity; otherwise, the model is weak and needs strengthening and modification of the items, and the weak items drop out of the body of the model. I relied only on the three sources below; the honorable reviewers are certainly fully familiar with structural equation modeling, and we refrained from giving its details here and in the body of the manuscript because it is a standard and is perfectly clear.
   It was modified in Table 5
   Model fit indices (NFI, NNFI, CF, RFI and IF) should be equal to or greater than 0.9 based on relevant and valid references, including:
   Bagh Khasti, F., Niaz Azari, K., & Jabari, N. (2020). Provide a genuine leadership model in the major universities of medical sciences in Region One. Educational researches, 15(64), 1-26.
   Heydari S, Barzegar M, Mohammad Davoudi AH. Analyzing the Factor Structure of the Scale "Evaluation of Cyber Security Culture and Awareness" (Case study: Employees of Bank branches in Ahvaz City): Journal of Psychological Methods and Models 2023; 14 (51): 113-126.
   Razavi, S. A., & Mohammadali Tajrishi, I. (2022). Designing a Model for Risk Management and Energy Insurance in the Upstream Part of the Iranian Petroleum Industry. Economics and Regional Development Journal, 29(2): 30-54. (in Persian with English abstract)

Associate Editor 1:

Comment no.5: Your response is not acceptable. you should explain the setting in details.

Students were selected from each of the 5 universities in proportion to the number of students each had; for example, since the student population of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences was larger, 128 students from this university were included in the study as samples. Their complete information is presented in Table 1.

Comments no.7,8,9: It is not enough to explain the issue for the reviewer but you should add this explanation in the manuscript as well.

COMMENT 7:DONE IN PAGE 4

(The participants in the study were given complete assurance regarding the confidentiality of their personal information as well as the analysis of the information received from them as a statistical population and not in the form of individual information.

The questionnaire was designed in a user-friendly way.

Before sending the survey, participants were sent an email to learn more about the objectives and motivation of the survey and to participate in the study if they were interested.)

COMMENT 8:TABE 2

How you compare groups (teachers and students)? by the test of two independent groups

COMMENT 9: DONE IN PAGE 4

In order to reduce the bias, the sample was randomly selected from the target population.

Before sending the survey, participants were sent an email to learn more about the objectives and motivation of the survey and to participate in the study if they were interested.

Participants entered the study with consent

Comment no.13: flowcharts are not only for trials they can use for clarifications everywhere.

The flowchart was provided based on the total number of participants, the number selected, data attrition, and the final population (Diagram 1, page 4).

Comments no. 15,17,18 are not highlighted in the manuscript.

Comment 15:

The findings of Khorasani's study are consistent with the results of our study; however, in their research the statistical population consisted only of students, whereas in our study faculty members also completed the questionnaires in addition to students. Moreover, our study was conducted in a macro-region and assessed 5 universities with different conditions.

Comment 17
added. Page 8
Comment 18:
in the last two lines of page 8, the conclusion section was added

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 9 Mar 2024

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 9 Mar 2024

Dear Author(s)
1- This is a cross-sectional study, so explaining the setting in detail, not only in tables but also in the first lines of the methods section, is vital.
Other parts are acceptable now.
Thank you

5

Revision 4

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.

Greetings, with courtesy and respect, to the honorable reviewers and the respected officials of the journal, who during this period, by expressing valuable and scholarly opinions, not only strengthened and improved the quality of the manuscript but also contributed greatly to the knowledge and experience of the authors. We sincerely express our utmost gratitude and appreciation, and wish the honorable reviewers and the journal staff a year full of health, success, and well-being.

The points raised by the dear reviewers have been addressed. We hope that they will be approved.

Reviewer 1:
1. Revise "below table".

It was done in the explanations of tables 1 to 5 and diagrams 1 and 2
2. In Table 3, report exact P-values for all of the correlations.

Done in table 3
3. P=0.000 is not true. Report as <0.001

Done
4. Revise "the below data".

Done
5. Revise "below diagram".

Done

Reviewer 2

1- *This is a cross sectional study so explaining the setting in details not only in tables but also in the first lines of method part is vital.*
Other parts is acceptable now
Done in paper 3

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

5 Revision 4

1 comment · 25 Mar 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 25 Mar 2024

Thank you to the authors for correcting the manuscript based on the comments.

6

Revision 5

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.

Reply to reviewers' comments one by one

Associate Editor 1:

Thank authors for correcting the manuscript based on comments

Associate Editor 2:

1. In Table 3, remove the last column. Done in table 3 remove the last column.

2. Remove all of the "at the <0.01 level". Done in page 5-6. all of the "at the <0.01 level Remove.

3. Diagram 2 is not about the correlation. Revise it in the results section and in the legend. Done in page 7 &n 9.

Last comment reviewer

1. **Diagram 1** is not mentioned in the text correctly (or you have forgotten to mention one or more figures in the article body). Please, mention **Diagram 1** in the text consecutively. Done in page 4. N. 4 & 9 & 11.

6 Revision 5

0 comments

No public comments in this round.