Educational Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 11 · Issue 1 · e119946

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Correlation Between Self-esteem and Academic Self-concept in Medical Students

Saeideh Daryazadeh, maryam yavari, Mohammadreza Sharif, Mohammad Javad Azadchehr, Marzieh Kiani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
1 Oct 2021	11 Jan 2022	19 Jan 2022	10.5812/erms-119946

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 10 Dec 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Dec 2021

The manuscript needs revision to explain the rationale for conducting the study and its novelty compared with similar articles.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Thanks to the respected reviewers

The response to the comments is below and the others is highlighted in the text of the manuscript.

The response to the referee's comments is highlighted in yellow in the text.

All comments have been edited in the text.

Reviewer 1:
With greetings and wishes for good health. The review of the article is submitted to you.

With greetings and respect.

The article was reviewed. The comments of the two respected reviewers were also examined. The first reviewer looked at the article very leniently and did not pay sufficient attention to specific issues that should have been addressed in this article. The comments of the second reviewer, except for the final decision on the article, are correct, and the revisions regarding explaining the reason for conducting the research, correcting the way the results are presented, and correcting the way the discussion is written seem correct and necessary. In my opinion, after making the revisions suggested by the second reviewer, it can be published in the journal.

Reviewer 2:
Greetings and Regards
Article judging response
Relationship between self-esteem and academic self-concept in medical students

- The abstract is appropriate) Medical education keywords do not need to be deleted(These are better words.

In keywords:

self-concept, Academic Success

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Self-esteem

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=self-concept

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Academic+achievement

2. The introduction is sufficient and appropriate

ok

3-- A long and very detailed method of paying attention to the details of the questionnaires, which is not necessary, and instead the sample size, sample selection should be mentioned.

-Mention the reason for choosing statistical methods

The requested items are highlighted in the Methods section

4-Results: Table 1 does not need to be given in the text of a one-line explanation, Table 3 does not need to be mentioned in the text (deleted)

The requested items are highlighted in the results section

5-- Discuss :

- It is better to use new studies

-Studies close to the results if used

The articles used in the discussion are related to the subject of the article. Although not all of them are new, they cannot be deleted.

6- The conclusion is appropriate ok

7-- Edit bugs

8-References need to be reconsidered

Edited items are highlighted in yellow

In my opinion, it can be published in general with modification

Reviewer 3:
The article needs revision in terms of explaining the reason for conducting the study and its novelty compared with similar articles.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.