



**Manuscript: “Medical Students’ Perception and preferences on Methods of Anatomy Teaching- A survey between public and private institutes of Karachi, Pakistan”**

**Submitted: 17 August 2020**

**Accepted: 16 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Munib Abbas

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p277](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p277)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Yasser Adnan Abu Jaish

Al-Ghad International Colleges for Applied Medical Sciences, Saudi Arabia

**Reviewer 2:** Mathias J. A. Asaarik

Tamale Teaching Hospital, Ghana

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Reviewer Name:   | Email:                                  |
| University/Country:  |   |
| Date Manuscript Received: 22/8/2020  | Date Review Report Submitted: 25/8/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Student's outlook on contemporary anatomy teaching practices in medical school & proposed avenues to upgrade |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: e-ISSN: 1857-7431   |   |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No   |   |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No                  |   |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No                                      |   |

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i>  | <i>Rating Result</i><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|---|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i><br><b>The study sought to assess the perception of private and public medical schools students on teaching methods. The title as stated above is not very clear and exact and is not the exact reflection of the content of the study.</b> |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>  | <b>2</b>  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>results.</b>   |          |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>Most part of the abstract was just an introduction to anatomy and teaching methods. The methodology was limited to sample size, no results of the study was communicated in the abstract and no conclusion.</b>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>There are major grammatical errors especially in the methodology and results. Example “Assess” instead of “Access”</b>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>The methodology had nothing about why and how those particular schools were selected, there was no explanation about how each study participant was selected, the information on analysis was too brief. In all, the methodology was too brief and inadequate and no information about ethical clearance and quality control.</b>            |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>   | <b>2</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>The introduction was too brief and did not offer clear explanation on the topic. Only four references were cited in-text which appear grossly inadequate. The results were limited to graphs and simple frequency distribution tables. The authors claimed they did chi-square analysis which could not be found in the results section.</b> |          |
| <b>The discussion section was a repetition of the introduction and results. In fact the new literature in the discussion is more than the introduction section. Number of in-text references in the discussion far exceeded the in-text references in the introduction.</b>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>The conclusion reflects the results as in the study.</b>   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>The in-text references in the introduction are only 4 while the discussion has about 17 in-text references. The authors however captured all references in the reference list.</b>   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            |          |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | <b>X</b> |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| Reject |  |
|--------|--|

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The authors should add more information to the introduction, offer detail explanation on the methodology, e.g selection of schools, individual participants, data collection, analysis, ethical clearance among others. The results should be improved upon by revising the analysis and the discussion should be rewritten to reflect points of agreement of the study results with existing literature and gaps that have been closed or identified in the course of this study.

The entire work should also be prove read to identify and correct grammatical errors.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Reviewer Name: Dr. Yasser Adnan Abu Jaish   |   |
| University/Country: Al-Ghad International Colleges for Applied Medical Sciences   |   |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21/8/2020   | Date Review Report Submitted: 30/8/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Student's outlook on contemporary anatomy teaching practices in medical school & proposed avenues to upgrade. |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number:  |   |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes   |   |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes                      |   |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes  |   |

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

| <i>Questions</i>   | <i>Rating Result</i><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>                         | <b>5</b>  |
| <i>The title is clear and adequate to the content. (Consider the apostrophe in the word Students')</i> |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>                                  | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>The components of the abstract (Methods, Results, and Conclusions) are not</i>                      |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>adequate and could be more comprehensive</i>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>                              | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The manuscript is free of grammar mistakes, but some words need to rewrite in the right manner.</i>         |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The research methods are explained well.</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The paper is clear.<br/>The punctuation marks and the abbreviations could be considered and rearranged.</i> |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>                                | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The conclusions are not comprehensive and isn't adequate for the research.</i>                              |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The references are comprehensive but don't match the APA style.</i>   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |   |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | x |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |   |
| Reject                                     |   |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I would like to congratulate you for this research, and I wish you more success.

I'm sending you the suggestions for improving your manuscript.

- *The components of the abstract (Methods, Results, and Conclusions) could be more comprehensive*
- *There are some words in the manuscript that need to rewrite in the right manner.*
- *The punctuation marks and definite articles could be considered and rearranged.*
- *The conclusion could be more comprehensive..*
- *Please rewrite the references according to the APA style and font of the manuscript.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**