

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	What should be measured? Nursing education institutions performance: a qualitative study
AUTHORS	Ghofrani, Marjan; Valizadeh, Leila; Zamanzadeh, Vahid; Ghahramanian, Akram; Jannati, Ali; Taleghani, Fariba

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lyman, B College of Nursing, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
REVIEW RETURNED	22-May-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for conducting this study and submitting it for publication! This topic of this study is quite unique and is relevant to nursing education. I appreciate the decision to sample students for this study. While their perspectives provide only part of what is important to evaluate in nursing programs, it is an essential part and this study helps illustrate the value of students' perspectives.</p> <p>I have a few recommendation for strengthening your manuscript: I believe the manuscript could benefit from English language editing. While the main ideas and arguments are generally understandable, clarity and readability could be much better with additional language editing.</p> <p>The introduction is pretty well organized and referenced. You may want to discuss the Donabedian model in the introduction, just so readers have more context for understanding what the model is and why you chose it.</p> <p>More detail about how many potential participants there were, and how the participants were recruited would be helpful.</p> <p>The results section would benefit from better contextualization of the quotes. You already do this to an extent, but some of the quotes need more explanation and/or interpretation for the reader to clearly understand what the quote means.</p> <p>The discussion section would benefit from better organization and depth. By organization, I mean clearly stating the main ideas you intend to make in the discussion section, then using the subsequent paragraphs to elaborate on those main ideas. By depth, I mean providing a more detailed analysis of how your results are similar to or different from others' research, and what new information or insights your study adds to the field.</p> <p>The discussion section would also benefit from more clearly articulated implications from the study. What should faculty,</p>
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>researchers, leaders, students do or think differently as a result of your study?</p> <p>In the limitations section, please explain your reasoning in concluding that an impersonal topic would not influence the study's rigor.</p> <p>The references are generally appropriate. However, it would be beneficial to update several of the references. I understand that, in some cases, citing an older, a seminal article is appropriate. However, some of the references were published more than 10 years ago and are not seminal articles.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Tavernier, Jennifer Lane Community College
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Jun-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Abstract: I would mention the Donebian model in "re Statistics used in the demographic characteristics check out. By "components" do you mean "themes?" Is this a thematic analysis?</p>
-------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

<p>Dear Dr. B Lyman, We appreciate you for reviewing the article and your expert recommendation for improving the manuscript.</p>	
Comments	Responses
I believe the manuscript could benefit from English language editing. While the main ideas and arguments are generally understandable, clarity and readability could be much better with additional language editing.	The manuscript was revised by an English expert.
The introduction is pretty well organized and referenced. You may want to discuss the Donabedian model in the introduction, just so readers have more context for understanding what the model is and why you chose it	There is some explanation about the model in the data analysis section. A few lines were also added to the introduction.
More detail about how many potential participants there were, and how the participants were recruited would be helpful.	More details were added to the "Setting and samples:" section.
The results section would benefit from better contextualization of the quotes. You already do this to an extent, but some of the quotes need more explanation and/or interpretation for the reader to clearly understand what the quote means.	More explanations were added to the results section.
The discussion section would benefit from better organization and depth. By organization, I mean clearly stating the main ideas you intend to make in the discussion section, then using the subsequent paragraphs to elaborate on those	Discussion section was revised.

main ideas. By depth, I mean providing a more detailed analysis of how your results are similar to or different from others' research, and what new information or insights your study adds to the field.	
The discussion section would also benefit from more clearly articulated implications from the study. What should faculty, researchers, leaders, students do or think differently as a result of your study?	The implication of the study expanded.
In the limitations section, please explain your reasoning in concluding that an impersonal topic would not influence the study's rigor	More explanation added.
The references are generally appropriate. However, it would be beneficial to update several of the references. I understand that, in some cases, citing an older, a seminal article is appropriate. However, some of the references were published more than 10 years ago and are not seminal articles	References were updated.

Dear Dr. Jennifer Tavernier, We appreciate you for reviewing the manuscript and your expert recommendation for improving the manuscript.	
Abstract: I would mention the Donebian model in "re	The Donabedian Model was mentioned in the result section of the Abstract.
Statistics used in the demographic characteristics check out.	Statistics were rechecked and the sentences were edited as they may be confusing.
By "components" do you mean "themes?" Is this a thematic analysis?	Because we conducted a content analysis based on the Donabedian three components model we named this section "components". The categories that we found in our study are assigned to each of these three components. Structure, process, and outcome are mentioned in literatures as components or dimensions. Actually, these three are dimensions or components of quality. (Content analysis is designed to classify the words in a text into categories. The researcher is looking for repeated ideas or patterns of thought. In exploratory descriptive qualitative studies, researchers may analyze the content of the text using concepts from a guiding theory.(1)

References:

1. Gray JR, Grove SK, Sutherland S. Burns and Grove's The Practice of Nursing Research - E-Book: Appraisal, Synthesis, and Generation of Evidence. 2016.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lyman, B College of Nursing, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Oct-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for revising your manuscript. I can see you have invested a lot of effort into improving it, and it is now a much stronger manuscript. You have addressed many of the comments I shared in my first review. My only remaining hesitancy is the manuscript's clarity and readability, which could still be improved through additional English language editing.