

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_89765
Title of the Manuscript:	How Impostor Syndrome Affects Academic Performance and Leadership Virtues Among Undergraduate Clinical Year Medical Students
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is good but too lengthy. please summarise it to maximum 300 words.</p> <p>Keywords are too many. Advice to cut down to a maximum of 5.</p> <p>Well written introduction section. However, 'Imposter Syndrome' is not a name which need capital letters. you can use "imposter syndrome" with small letters uniformly throughout the article or suggest to use Imposter Syndrome (IP) as in short form or abbreviations. References number cited in a sentence should be before a full stop and not after. This is advised to be done throughout the article.</p> <p>The methodology section is good but can be improved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calculation of the sample size is suggested to be shown to avoid any discretion. 2. Could you also include the approval number from the Research Ethics Committee? 3. Kindly also include the validity and reliability test for YIS, SAAS, LVQ. and all the questionnaires used. <p>The result section is OK but can be further improved.</p> <p>If possible the result section for table 2 should be put above the related table and so goes with the rest of the result section and tables related. So it would be easier to read and understand. To put the result section and tables separately can be confusing.</p> <p>The discussion section is quite well written. If possible to separate the Discussion from the Limitation section. Best to separate the Limitation section from the Discussion section</p> <p>In the conclusion section, you do not have to repeat the results. Just try to conclude based on the significant finding and why this is an important subject to tackle.</p> <p>Your references section is haphazard. firstly the numbering of the journals used is not reflected in the article which is only un to [23]. while the number of references stated is [41]. there is no alignment. Secondly i see that the references used are mainly from the internet. Are this resources reliable? Best to use recent journals, books or thesis to cite and refer to. Some do not even have the names of the authors...and make sure to follow the style of writing the references are in accordance with AJMA</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Generally well written but may require few improvements here and there to make it an excellent article. Congratulatio	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azmah Binti Sa'at
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia