

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Self-directed learning is critical for anatomy students because it promotes critical thinking, lifelong learning, and personalized learning experiences. As the field of medicine continues to advance, equipping students with the skills for independent learning will not only enhance their understanding of anatomy but also prepare them for successful and adaptable careers in health care. By adopting SDL, anatomy students can develop the skills necessary to thrive in a complex and dynamic professional environment. Therefore, this article is suggested to the scientific community, the results of which have shown that students enjoy self-directed learning in anatomy, and this method combined with technology can lead to increased learning.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is long and can be shortened and the following title can be replaced: Perception of First Year MBBS Students on Self-Directed Learning in Anatomy	
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.	The abstract is long and the introduction and aim and objectives can be combined. Also, in the method section, the research method is not specifically mentioned.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The overall structure of the article is correct. Introduction, materials and methods, statistical analysis, findings, discussion, conclusion and acknowledgments and sources are mentioned.	
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.	This article is scientifically accurate because the steps of conducting the research are specified with a scientific and written method, and the implementation method is also clearly defined. Also, from the technical point of view, the research implementation method has been carefully specified, the research results have been clearly specified, and the discussion and conclusions have also been specified carefully.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references is very lowl and also the references are related to the years before 2017. Authors are advised to review similar research on the research topic from 2017 to 2024 and add in the introduction and references section.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The written language of the article is fluent but could be better and more academic.	
Optional/General comments	In the introduction, the background of the past research is not stated, and the research problem and its dimensions are not specified. It is written in the title of communication skills, but the measurement tool related to it is not mentioned, nor are the results related to it mentioned. In the method section, there is no explanation about the reliability and validity of the measurement tool. In the discussion section, it is not compared with past research. Limitations and discussion for future research are not mentioned in the conclusion section.	

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:	Behnam Rasouli
Department, University & Country	Farhangian University, Iran