Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 22 · Issue 1 · e135153

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Relationship Between Academic Burnout and Hope for the Future in Medical Students: Mediating Role of the Stress

Kazem Aryaei Moghadam, Hamdollah Jayervand, Behnam Makvandi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 Jan 2023	10 Apr 2023	27 May 2023	10.5812/jme-135153

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, Referee 2 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 2 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 11 Feb 2023 – 22 Feb 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 11 Feb 2023

Title:
The title does not indicate the work done because the model and the mediating role of stress are not included in the title.
Abstract:
In the Abstract, the conclusion is not written according to the results, and only the importance of the model is mentioned.
Introduction:
In line 43, it is written that hope for the future plays a role in academic burnout. How did you reach this conclusion? Please provide a citation.
In the introduction, the relationship between the variables is not clear. For example, what is the role of stress?
It is not clear why only medical students were included. If another field was compared with medicine, would the results be different?
Throughout the introduction, there is no reference to the research results of other researchers.
Methods:
The career attitude questionnaire is related to high school students, not university students who, by choosing medicine, do not have a vague career future. They may not know where they will work or how much their income will be, but is this not different from the situation of a student who does not yet know which field they will be accepted into?
There is no description of the model and its application; this description must be added.
Results:
In this section, the model has shown the relationship between the components, but there is no mention of whether these numbers are normal or how the designers of the questionnaire interpret the scores.
Discussion: In the discussion, while comparing the results of your research with those of others, authors should interpret the reasons for the similarities or differences, which, unfortunately, the authors did not report.
It seems that this work is part of a larger work and that this is the reason for these uncertainties. If so, please provide the results of the whole work.
Discussion:
At the beginning of the discussion, it is better to mention the purpose of the study, then compare and analyze the results of your study with those of others based on the detailed goals.
Finally:
The question is: why have the results been published after 10 years?

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 22 Feb 2023

Title: Relationship of Academic Burnout with Hope for the Future in Medical Students: Mediated by Stress
The article complies with the author's guide on the Journal's site.
The methodology is consistent with the type of article.
The number of words corresponds to the article type.
Article Review Criteria:
I am grateful that the authors have addressed academic burnout in their article.

Material & Methods:

 The power of the study was not mentioned.

 The formula for calculating the sample size is not mentioned.

 The sampling method is not described, nor are inclusion and exclusion criteria for the participants described.

 How did you confirm the validity and reliability of this questionnaire?

 How many items and subscales does this instrument have? How are the items of the questionnaire evaluated? How is the test scored and how are the results interpreted?

 Were all quantitative variables in your study normally distributed?

 What statistical tests did you use to analyze the data?

 What was the significance level?

 You must mention the study ethics code.

 You must mention the license and the company through which you accessed SPSS version 27.

 You have not explained the SEM model.

 At what stage of their studies were the medical students participating in the present study? Second, third, fourth year, and so on?

 What was the sampling period in the present study?

 Explain how to avoid selection bias in sampling.

 Basic science students differ from preclinical and clinical students in terms of stressors. Have you paid attention to this issue?

Discussion:

 In the discussion section, you have compared the results of your study well with the results of other studies. However, it is better to compare the results of your study with the results of other studies one by one rather than collectively.

 One of the limitations of your study is that the instruments were completed by self-report, and there is a possibility that people did not answer the questions correctly.

 The article needs to be edited in terms of scientific writing.

Overall Evaluation:

Major revision

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.

Dear editor,

Thank you for your valuable and useful comments and suggestions. We have modified the manuscript accordingly.

Reply to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1:

Regarding sample size adequacy, more details are provided in the method section: "The sample size was determined based on the number of variables and the statistical model. In SEM, the number of parameters is calculated based on the number of direct paths, exogenous variables, and error variances. According to Loehlin and Beaujean (reference: #23), and considering the number of paths and variables, 250 to 300 participants were sufficient to test the proposed model and study hypotheses. To predict participant attrition, a total of 310 participants were selected through convenience sampling. The instruments were given to the participants, 301 of whom answered the items completely and entered the study."

The sampling method was reported in the method section.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the research were presented in the method section.

Regarding the validity and reliability of the research questionnaires, more details were added to the research instruments section.

Regarding the number of items, scoring methods, minimum and maximum scores, as well as the interpretation of the scores of the questionnaires, more details were presented in the research instruments.

The method of data analysis was presented in the method section.

Regarding the normal distribution of the data, details were provided in the results section.

The significance level of this study was reported in the data analysis section.

Ethical considerations of the present study were presented in the method section.

The name of the company was provided to access SPSS in the data analysis section.

In the present study, 52.16 and 47.84 percent of the participants were undergraduate and graduate students, respectively.

The sampling period in the present study was from April 16 to May 21, 2022.

Some cases such as the difference between basic science students and preclinical and clinical students in stressors as well as sampling bias were among the limitations of the present study.

In the discussion section, the results of consistent and inconsistent studies were mentioned.

In the limitations section, the self-report tool of the research was mentioned.

The article was revised in terms of writing and errors were corrected.

Reviewer 2:

The title of the article was corrected.

The conclusion in the abstract section was rewritten based on the research results.

References were mentioned in the introduction section.

In the introduction section, the relationships between research variables were mentioned.

In the fourth paragraph of the introduction section, it was mentioned about the stress variable and its relationship with academic burnout.

According to the statistical population of the current study, the emphasis of the material was on medical students. In the limitations section, caution was given about generalizing the results to other students.

In the introduction section, the research results of other researchers were mentioned.

In this study, the Attitudes towards Education and Career Prospects Scale was used to measure hope for the future in the students (Tarverdizadeh et al. reference: #25). This scale is standardized in university students: (https://jpsy.riau.ac.ir/article_1122.html?lang=en)

The theoretical model of the research was presented as Figure 1 in the article.

Regarding the normal distribution of the data, findings were added to the results section.

In the discussion section, the results of consistent and inconsistent studies were mentioned.

At the beginning of the discussion section, the objectives of the research were mentioned, followed by the results and the interpretation of the results.

This research was done in 2022.

Best regards

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 26 May 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 May 2023

The author has revised and rewritten the text of the article based on all the referee's comments.