



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_38442
Title of the Manuscript:	Do Students Value Feedback? - A Study On Differing Perceptions By Students In The Feedback Process In Medical And Health Sciences University
Type of the Article	Short Research Articles

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please attend to the language, many grammatical issues especially subject/verb disagreement. Avoid repeating concepts [see 6th 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>	
Minor 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2nd paragraph under “Results” – “...seem to reduce my [THEIR?] anxiety about...” and “...is important to me [THEM?].”</p> <p>Discussion: 3rd paragraph, line 5: “And the similar results were found in our study also” – please rephrase.</p>	
Optional/General 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 2nd 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 2nd 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 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	LJC Erasmus
Department, University & Country	Physiology and Environmental Health, School of Molecular and Life Sciences, University of Limpopo, South Africa