



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRMPS_38442</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Do Students Value Feedback? - A Study On Differing Perceptions By Students In The Feedback Process In Medical And Health Sciences University</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Articles</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Please attend to the language, many grammatical issues especially subject/verb disagreement. Avoid repeating concepts [see 6<sup>th</sup> line under “introduction” – “Previous research has identified...”]. Why is there mention of the lack of a coherent theoretical model [thereby creating the impression of relevance and a possible focus of this study], when there is no attention given to it further on.</p> <p>In Materials and methods a major concern is the absolute lack of indicating exactly what number of participants were involved in this study. How were they selected? Were they equally selected from Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing? Power factors used to determine group sizes, etc.</p> <p>There is an indication that Ethics approval was obtained – provide details [exact name of Ethics committee, from which institution as well as the approval number].</p>	<p>We agree with your comments and will make necessary revisions</p> <p>The Coherent theoretical model is the foundation from which all knowledge is constructed (metaphorically and literally) for a research study. It serves as the structure and support for the rationale for the study, the problem statement, the purpose, the significance, and the research questions. It provides a grounding base, or an anchor, for the literature review, and most importantly, the methods and analysis. There is a relevance of it in our study as we have tried to integrate the constructs in our study into a coherent theoretical model which had been lacking in many earlier similar studies.</p> <p>The number of students included were 50 from each group[medical dental, undergraduate nursing and post graduate nursing] totalling 200</p> <p>Ethics approval was obtained from -RAKMHSU Research and Ethics Committee. Name of the Institute : RAK Medical and Health Sciences University. Reference no: RAKMHSU-REC-71-2014</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the aim and objectives: try to use synonyms for “to study” [not very creative writing if 3 of the 4 objectives are “to study”]. The sections for the questionnaire [under Methods and Materials] are incorrectly numbered. The inclusion of demographic data in the questionnaire seems a waste of time as only gender was sensibly used in this manuscript. Results: refrain from starting a sentence with a number, write it out. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under “Results” – “...seem to reduce my [THEIR?] anxiety about...” and “...is important to me [THEM?].” Discussion: 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, line 5: “And the similar results were found in our study also” – please rephrase.</p>	<p>Thank you we agree with your comments Necessary changes will be made</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Work such as this is always much appreciated, and of tremendous value to academics, especially for those with a fondness of teaching. Some concerns exist regarding this study, and I'm just wondering if the authors thought about/considered the relevance of this information. In this particular study there is constant reference to “faculty”, yet I'm convinced that all of these students have different subjects and are part of different schools within this specific faculty. Can we take it for granted that for this specific 2<sup>nd</sup> year group, the feedback practices were exactly the same across all subjects? Furthermore, would students repeating certain courses perceive feedback the same as those who are doing a 2<sup>nd</sup> year subject for the first time? In addition, there seems to be students from 3 different “fields” in this study: medicine, dentistry and nursing – it might have been a good idea to investigate whether these different groups perceive feedback in the same way. I know that curricula for these groups are most probably quite different and that minimum requirements for enrolment into them are different as well – would it be so far-fetched to argue that</p>	<p>Thank you we agree with your comments For all groups the feedback practice are same</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>academic demands would be different as well and that we cannot [necessarily?] see them as equals? In essence if it is found that they are the same then the recommendations to teaching practice improvements are quite straight forward; however, if they are different then much harm can be done if we treat all groups the same when it comes to feedback practices. In general I would be cautious to support a “generic” feedback process for groups with [possible] different needs.</p>	
--	--	--