OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.97984
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(9); e97984

Peer Review Report for "Teaching Cardiac Arrhythmias Using Educational Videos and Simulator Software in Nurses: An Educational Interventional Study"

Author(s): Hamed Tavan, Siros Norouzi, Masoumeh Shohani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	21 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	10 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	22 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

29 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
In the current study, the authors have investigated the efficacy of a new educational method for teacing ECG.
The manuscript is well written and the study question is valid. However the study faces some limitations.
1- The sample volume is very small, the authors should provide an explanation as, why they couldn't enroll more participants.
2- Since there is an intervention happening, the study needs a control group with a proper randomization method to provide definitive results. With its current form, the authors can claim that the new educational method increased the knoledge of the participant. But, is this method more effective than tge traditional methods? That is a very important question that this study can not answer, or if such comparisons are done byit can not be understood from the text.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

12 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- The subject of the study is interesting
2- The English language needs revision, there are several grammatical and spelling errors. For example "care sand" should change to "cares and", "there may be impossible" to "it may be impossible", "category" to "categorized", and several more typing errors. The authors should use the expertise of a professional editor before resubmitting the manuscript.
2- The sample size is small and the authors should explain it as a limitation.
3- The study has no control group and the authors should mention it as a major limitation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
The manuscript is studied, According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor,

Thank you for your attention and valuable comments.

The manuscript edited.

1. This study is a quasi-experimental study **that** twenty-two navies' nurses selected based on census method and evaluated before and after the educational interventions for cardiac arrhythmia.
2. In this quasi-experimental study there is not control group.
3. Use of census method, small sample size and lack of control group are limitation in this study.
4. The English language was revised by an expert person.

By sincerely,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 28 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
In the current revision, the authors have tried to determine the effects of teaching cardiac arrhythmia using educational videos and simulator software in nurses. Using a quasi-experimental design, 22 novice nurses were selected based on the census method. Evaluations were performed before and after educational interventions for cardiac arrhythmia.They have seen an effective change with their intervention.
Comments:
1- Although the sample size is not large enough and there is no control group has no intervention performed on, the study conduct seems desirable and the manuscript is well written.
2- The conclusion both in the abstract and the main manuscript is not derived from the results. The Authors can only conclude that their intervention would increase the ability of participants in reading ECG.
3- It would be better to place the sample size determination in the statistical methods part.
Thanks.

Mitra Amini: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 1 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor,

Thank you for your attention and valuable comments.

The manuscript edited.

1. The conclusion both in abstract and the main manuscript was corrected.
2. The sample size determination in was placed in the statistical methods.

By sincerely,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
There is need for editing . For instance what you changed in the abstract should be (arrhythmia detection rate was increased after intervention)
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor,

Thank you for your attention and valuable comments.

The manuscript edited.

1. The conclusion both in abstract and the main manuscript was corrected. The statement of "arrhythmia detection rate was increased after intervention" was added.

By sincerely,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 22 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.