

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_125990
Title of the Manuscript:	Do Medical Students Still Need Practicum and Laboratory Classes in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it addresses the ongoing debate about the role of practicum and laboratory classes in medical education amidst the rise of AI technologies. The manuscript highlights the irreplaceable value of hands-on experience and human interaction in medical training, which AI cannot fully replicate. I appreciate this manuscript because it brings attention to the balance needed between adopting new technologies and preserving essential traditional teaching methods. However, I dislike the manuscript's somewhat repetitive discussion and lack of new empirical data to support its claims.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Do Medical Students Still Need Practicum and Laboratory Classes in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?" is suitable as it directly addresses the core question of the study. An alternative title could be: "Balancing AI and Traditional Methods: The Role of Practicum and Laboratory Classes in Medical Education."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from a more structured format. It should clearly state the background, aim, methods, key findings, and conclusions. Adding specific examples of the benefits and limitations of AI in medical education could enhance the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. However, more distinct separation between sections discussing AI benefits and those focusing on the importance of practicum would improve readability.</p>	
<p>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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it integrates extensive literature on the benefits and challenges of AI in medical education. It correctly identifies the limitations of AI, such as ethical issues and the lack of human touch, which are well-documented. However, it would benefit from empirical data or case studies to support its arguments further.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies. One suggestion for additional references is to include more recent studies on the effectiveness of AI in specific areas of medical education to provide a more balanced view.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Separate the discussion on AI benefits and practicum importance more clearly. <input type="checkbox"/> Include recent empirical studies or case studies to support arguments. <input type="checkbox"/> Address minor grammatical errors and improve sentence structure for better readability. <p>The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication but could be improved by correcting minor grammatical errors and refining sentence structure.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This suggests that it requires minor revisions before publication</p> <p>NIL</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Smita R. Sorte
Department, University & Country	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India