

Review Form2

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2288
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of First Year MBBS Students on Self-Directed Learning in Anatomy: Improves Concept, Retention and Communication skills
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Peer Review: Perception of First Year MBBS Students on Self-Directed Learning in Anatomy 1. Title and Abstract: Title: The title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content of the study. However, it could be slightly refined to enhance clarity. Consider rephrasing to "Perception of First-Year MBBS Students on the Impact of Self-Directed Learning in Anatomy: Enhancing Concept Retention and Communication Skills." Abstract: The abstract provides a concise overview of the study, including the background, aims, methods, results, and conclusions. However, the abstract could benefit from a slight restructuring to improve readability. For instance, clearly separating the sections (e.g., Objectives, Methods, Results, Conclusion) with subheadings or transitional phrases would enhance clarity. 2. Introduction: Strengths: The introduction establishes the importance of anatomy in medical education and the rationale for exploring self-directed learning (SDL) as a teaching method. The context provided on the need for innovative teaching methods is relevant and timely. Areas for Improvement: The introduction could benefit from a more focused discussion on the gaps in existing teaching methods and how SDL specifically addresses these gaps. Additionally, some sentences are lengthy and could be split for clarity. For example, "Syllabus of Anatomy is vast and also volatile to summarise large amounts of facts and train students for acquisition of skills we believes that student learn by practice" could be rephrased for conciseness. 3. Methods: Strengths: The study design is well-structured, with clear steps outlined for the SDL intervention. The use of both qualitative (feedback questionnaires) and quantitative (MCQs) methods to assess student perception and retention is commendable. Areas for Improvement: The methodology section lacks specific details on the statistical analysis. While the text mentions the use of paired and unpaired t-tests, it would be beneficial to include a brief explanation of why these tests were chosen and how the data was handled (e.g., normality tests, handling of missing data). 4. Results: Strengths: The results are presented clearly, with relevant charts and tables to support the findings. The improvement in post-test scores and positive feedback from students is well-documented. Areas for Improvement: The discussion of the results could be expanded to provide more insight into the implications of the findings. For example, discussing the potential reasons behind the observed improvement in post-test scores or how SDL might influence long-term retention of anatomical concepts would be valuable.	

	5. Discussion: Strengths: The discussion reiterates the key findings and highlights the benefits of SDL, particularly in improving communication skills and active participation. Areas for Improvement: The discussion could be enriched by comparing the findings with existing literature on SDL in medical education. Additionally, addressing any limitations of the study (e.g., sample size, generalizability) and suggesting areas for future research would strengthen the discussion. 6. Conclusion: Strengths: The conclusion effectively summarizes the main findings and the positive impact of SDL on student learning. Areas for Improvement: The conclusion could be more assertive by explicitly stating how these findings could influence future teaching practices in anatomy or medical education more broadly. 7. References: Strengths: The references are relevant and up-to-date, providing a solid foundation for the study. Areas for Improvement: Ensure consistency in reference formatting. Additionally, incorporating a few more recent studies on SDL could further support the study's findings. 8. Language and Style: Strengths: The manuscript is generally well-written, with clear and concise language. Areas for Improvement: There are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need revision. For example, the sentence "With the objective to check students understanding and knowledge on the topic `ARCHES OF FOOT' Selfdirected learning (SDL) is considered" could be revised for clarity. Consider a thorough proofread to address these issues. Overall Assessment: The manuscript presents a valuable study on the impact of SDL in anatomy education for first-year MBBS students. It contributes to the growing body of literature advocating for innovative teaching methods in medical education. With some refinements in language, structure, and depth of discussion, this manuscript has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field.	
--	--	--

Review Form2

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ameelia Sadaqa
Department, University & Country	Lahore Medical & Dental College, Pakistan