

# Proposal for Amending the Online Evaluation Process of the GMS Z Med Ausbild in the Manuscript Processing System (MOPS)

## Appraisal

The GMS Z Med Ausbild publishes articles on issue related to undergraduate studies, further education and continuing education in medicine, the didactics of medicine, adult education, quality management in teaching, educational psychology (where relevant for medical education), education policy and higher education. The aim of the journal is information and communication about undergraduate studies, further education and continuing education in medicine, including relevant research. The target audience are all people involved in higher education and interested individuals of the general public.

Please use the position paper of the committee of educational research methodology in combination with the following form for the reviewing of original papers or projects. After each assessment, you have the opportunity to comment on points and comments in the script (referring to page/line/comment).

## Content

**Overall Evaluation of Article:** Very good      insufficient n/a

Current / Original / Relevance of article for reader; contribution to developing research area

Initial short summary about what you see as the central points of the paper. Subsequently, brief response to the above points (current etc.) please.

**Title** (adequate relevance to research/project) Very good      insufficient n/a

Is all relevant information contained in the title so the reader gets the right impression of the article from the title?

Brief response on the title, incl. suggestions for possible improvement

**Summary** (succinct presentation of problem, short overview of results) Very good      insufficient n/a

For example, is all relevant information contained in the summary so the reader gets an accurate overview over the article?

Brief response on the summary, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

**Introduction** (Background, definition of problem, question hypothesis and aims) Very good      insufficient n/a

For example, does the introduction present a clear conceptual framework? Is the current state of research adequately backed up by the literature? Are knowledge gaps identified which the present work aims to deal with? Is a clear research question/hypothesis formulated or the project aim set out?

Brief response on the introduction, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

**Methodology** (Study design and methodology and project conduct, sample size/selection, instruments) **Very good**      **insufficient** **n/a**

For example, are the quantitative/qualitative methods adequately used? Has the study design been described precisely? Is the design suitable for answering the research query? Are sample size/selection adequate? Are appropriate instruments/methods of analysis used?

Brief response on the methodology, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

**Results** (Relevance, completeness, intelligibility, appropriate presentation of data, e.g. tables/graphics incl. legend) **Very good**      **insufficient** **n/a**

For example, is the relevant data presented adequately? Do the graphics/tables agree with the text? Is the data appropriate to answering the question? Is the data presented in a comprehensible way and is it complete?

Brief response on the results, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

**Discussion** (adequate interpretation of results, strengths/weaknesses analysis and limitations, relevance of results in relation to the question, plausibility of conclusions, relevance to conceptual framework) **Very good**      **insufficient** **n/a**

For example, are the results interpreted adequately and are strengths and weaknesses considered sufficiently? Is the relevance of the results presented adequately? Are the conclusions plausible? Is there reference to the conceptual framework? Is the question/hypothesis/aim answered?

Brief response on the discussion, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

## Format

**Format** **Very good**      **insufficient** **n/a**

Legibility, style, grammar, orthography, structuring of text, intelligibility

Brief response on the form of the text, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

**Appropriateness of illustrations and tables** **Very good**      **insufficient** **n/a**

Brief response on the appropriateness of illustrations and tables, incl. suggestions for possible improvements.

## Decision

I hereby propose the following for the manuscript in question

**Accept in current form**

**Accept following amendments**

**Decline with option of resubmission**

Time frame

Decline

normal

ASAP

### **Author Feedback**

Please provide **feedback** for the author even if you decline the article. The author will be grateful to you. Please bear in mind the following points!

You should begin with a summary that describes how something has been understood. This signals appreciation and can help clear possible misunderstandings early.

Feedback means to give information. Describe your own perception of how you have understood something. Use “I” rather than impersonal forms, or “we”. Use clear and precise language.

Both positive and critical aspects should be mentioned, the recommendation usually being to start with something positive.

Feedback is accepted better if it is constructive and spelled out clearly. List concrete details. Avoid commonplace statements, deep analysis and interpretations, moral statements or general interpretations.

### **Feedback for Editors**

(Free text, only visible for editors, e.g. conflicts of interest)