

Research in Medical Education (RIME): Sample Reviewer Review

A few comments / suggestions:

Abstract: I suggest being more specific about the purpose and the learning goals / objectives so readers can clearly see how the elements of your evaluation line up with goals / objectives. In methods, I don't know what you mean by "Mixed methods analysis informed by NIH best practice standards." Better just to clearly state what you collected and how you analyzed it.

Intro / Background:

Similar to the abstract, the last sentence of the first paragraph of the intro would be best to clearly define what aspects of impact you are looking at in this study.

The intro feels a little longer than necessary. I think the first few paragraphs on could be shortened The second portion of the intro is more helpful -

Methods:

The description of the curriculum and objectives is very helpful.

Outcomes assessment is a bit hard to follow. It might be easier and clearer to present this information in a table. Make a row for each of the objectives. Have a column for "curricular content / activities" relevant to each objective and another column for "methods / outcomes" associated with each objective. As currently structured, I had trouble linking the methods and outcomes to the objectives. Statistical analysis should be retitled "analysis" since it contains a mix of quantitative and qualitative. And it makes no sense to say "list of themes using grounded theory for content analysis." Grounded theory and content analysis are two different things. Which were you doing? My guess is you were using a general inductive approach to identify categories for qualitative content analysis. This means you had no pre-determined coding scheme, framework, or hypotheses when you reviewed the data.

Results:

Quantitative - I'm not clear why it was necessary to analyze each block independently. Since there were no differences, I'd remove this.

Qualitative - most of the first paragraph belongs in methods, not results (e.g. how many times the coding team met, how many [] were reviewed to reach saturation. When you mention saturation, it's important to explain how you determined that you had reached saturation.

I am a bit confused by the main themes, the subthemes, and the categories.

I think the organization of themes works well. I'd stick to that as the main focus, but make sure to link these findings back to the objectives of the curriculum.

Discussion:

Be careful about using terms like "significantly impact It sounds like statistical findings - but you have very limited statistical data to support this. All of it is self-report.

Portions of the discussion basically restate findings rather than discussing them. I would significantly

reduce or eliminate these paragraphs to allow more room to discuss interesting points like....
I was surprised by the statement "The overwhelming positive qualitative responses far surpassed authors' expectations." This seems like another good opportunity to expand the discussion.

Thank you for submitting this manuscript