

Review report

BSMMUJ-17.3 – 71848

Perceptions, views and opinions regarding use of mnemonics in teaching-learning: an email-based survey among Bangladeshi anatomy teachers

Akhter N *et al.* (najnin.anatomy@gmail.com)

REVIEW COMMENTS		AUTHOR RESPONSE
		[Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
A. Technical review		
ROUND 1		
Reviewer's name: Shawti Barua		
ORCID: 0009-0006-6553-9957		
Date assigned: 16-Mar-24		
Date submitted: 23-Mar-24		
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No		
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? Yes		
Comments sent to author (Date: 12-Jun-24)		Date: 31-Jul-24
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	Score	[Note: Please response if the score is below 6]
	8	-
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	8	-
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	9	-
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	10	-
1. This article provides a comprehensive and insightful analysis of anatomical mnemonics. The research design and methodology are clearly outlined. This article will contribute significantly to discussion on effective teaching strategies in Anatomy education.		-
Reviewer's recommendation: Accept Submission		
Reviewer's name: D		
ORCID: -		
Date assigned: 7-May-24		
Date submitted: 9-May-24		
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No		
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? No		
	Score	[Note: Please response if the score is below 6]
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	5	We revised the findings of the manuscript and tried to explain to reflect the originality of the work.
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	5	The manuscript has been revised as advised, followed the STROBE checklist and formatted based on the journal's guidelines.
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	6	-
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	8	-
Overview of the manuscripts: This manuscript focuses on 'Teachers' perspectives regarding use of mnemonics in teaching-learning: An e-mail-based		-

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
survey among Bangladeshi Anatomy teachers. This was descriptive cross-sectional research and conducted among 63 Bangladeshi anatomy teachers through email using 'Google form'. The researcher concluded that mnemonics like 'Acrostic' and 'Rhyme' would be more effective than 'Acronym' and 'Storytelling'.	
1. The problem was clearly stated in this manuscript, but the writing methodology was inadequate.	The method section has detailed the 'type of study' and 'aspects of mnemonics' addressed. The specific types of questions used in the questionnaire as well as the 'perceptions, views and opinions' assessed (reason behind) for each of the seven aspects of mnemonics have been detailed out. (Lines 121-171)
2. Results were not written according to the stated objectives.	The objectives of the research were analyses of perceptions, views and opinions of the Bangladeshi Anatomy teachers regarding seven aspects of the use of mnemonics in the teaching-learning of Anatomy. The results of the seven aspects are arranged in a sequential manner. (Lines 173-208)
3. This was descriptive cross-sectional research and the data gathered through the questionnaire-based survey were analyzed qualitatively, and then quantitated (150-151). Please describe how the qualitative data was analyzed. The response is inadequate.	"The data gathered analysed qualitatively, and then quantitated" has been replaced by the following: "For analysing the responses to the closed-ended questions (single-answer MCQs and multiple-answer MCQs) on all the seven aspects of mnemonics were expressed as percentage frequencies of the choices. Responses to the open-ended questions, where the teachers gave reasons for their particular responses, were compiled for exploring all the possible reasons thought of by the teachers." (Lines 167-171)
4. As mentioned, the data was collected mixed-method approach, it would be the best to display data separately. This manuscript exhibited only the results of the quantitative. This manuscript exhibited only the results of the quantitative. The response is inadequate.	As the quantitative analysis was presented in the manuscript, so we revised the methods accordingly. The method of analysis is detailed in lines 164-168 as mentioned above.
Reviewer's recommendation: Revisions Required	
Responsible Editor's name: Mohammed Saiful Islam Bhuiyan	
ORCID: 0000-0001-8532-4992	
1. Please mention the study period. Line numbers are not correct.	We mentioned the study period which looks as below: "This descriptive cross-sectional research was carried out in the Department of Anatomy, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University, Dhaka from 2017 to 2018." (Lines 34-35)
2. What was the criterion for selecting the teachers? Line numbers are not correct.	The criteria are described which looks as below: "It involved a survey through e-mail using 'Google Form' among 63 Bangladeshi Anatomy teachers with post-graduation in Anatomy and at least five years' teaching experience." (Lines 36)
3. Line 37-38: "On some predesigned questions covering different issues on mnemonics: please mention what types of questions were asked and what types of data were collected. (Within word limit)	"Responses were gathered to predesigned MCQs asking for single choice or multiple choices and open-ended questions to explore their perceptions, views and opinions on seven aspects of using mnemonics." (Lines 37-39)

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
In the abstract still it is not clear what information was collected (it may be the opinion and preference of using mnemonics.)	Revised the abstract.
4. Please mention the statistical methods and tools used in the study. Also, mention the statistical methods and tools used in the study.	The statistical analysis section is revised, which looks as below: “For analysing the responses to the closed-ended questions (single-answer MCQs and multiple-answer MCQs) on all the seven aspects of mnemonics were expressed as percentage frequencies of the choices. Responses to the open-ended questions, where the teachers gave reasons for their particular responses, were compiled for exploring all the possible reasons thought of by the teachers.” (Lines 167-171)
5. Text/figures: Tables and figures exceeded six. Figure 1 is not understandable. It should be redrawn if the authors wish to retain it in the final version of the manuscript.	Figure 1 and Table 5 have been removed to reduce the total table/figure number 6. Relevant results have been rewritten in textual form after the removal of Figure 1 and Table 5.
6. There is an article published by the same principal author in the KYAMC journal based on a study conducted in the same department, during the same study period, with the same number of samples, with nearly similar methodology and with a similar title “Using Mnemonics in Teaching-Learning: A Profile of Experiences of the Bangladeshi Anatomy Teachers”. Would you please let us know, is it a part of the same study or a different study? If those two were different studies, would you please mention the IRB number of both?	Yes, it is a part of the same study (and was an MS Anatomy thesis) The IRB memo no: BSMMU/2017/9906; date: 28.09.2017. The research has several components. One component was published in KYAMC which dealt with the teachers’ experiences in using mnemonics in Anatomy teaching-learning. This manuscript, on the other hand, deals with the perceptions, views and opinions of the teachers regarding the use of mnemonics in Anatomy teaching-learning. Considering the above-mentioned points and your query, the title of the present manuscript has been modified as: Teachers’ perceptions, views and opinions regarding use of mnemonics in teaching-learning: an e-mail based survey among Bangladeshi Anatomy teachers.
Responsible Editor’s recommendation: Revision Required	
Executive Editor’s name: M Mostafa Zaman	
1. Data availability statement needs revision. You have not submitted any such supplementary file. We do not need it either. You should use one statement that our authors are using. Please check our latest issue of the Journal.	The data availability statement is added: “We confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study will be shared upon reasonable request”. (Lines 303-305)
2. Funding: Indicate the memo number and date.	Recommended grant for thesis protocol of residents/students The document from BSMMU available to the PI contained only the relevant information: Serial no: 50, 2017-2018 No memo number and date were there.
3. Author contributions should have initials of the author’s names, not the full names.	a. Concept and design: NA & KMS b. Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data: NA c. Manuscript drafting and revising it critically: NA, MMM, FB & KMS d. Approval of the final version of the manuscript: NA, MMM, FB & KMS e. Guarantor accuracy and integrity of the work: KMS

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
	(Lines 291)
4. Please drop the acronym, BSMMU. (Line 296)	The acronym has been dropped.
5. Move the ORCID to the concerned author's name on the title page. Ensure that the ORCID has enough information about the author's education, employment, publication, etc.	ORCID has been moved to the concerned author's name.
6. Add DOIs to the journal references. URLs of websites should have accession dates.	DOI and URL have been modified. (Lines 309-356).
7. The paper published using the same data should cited, and redundancies should be avoided. Otherwise, the plagiarism check will disqualify the manuscript under consideration. The author's responses must be descriptive, indicating the line numbers in parentheses. The author, for instance, gives the line numbers or writes "reduced," "rewritten", "corrected," etc. The readers should understand what has been done and how the text looks. This is very important because the Author's Response will be published. A half-hearted response should not be published, tarnishing the image of the author and the Journal/Editor.	The previous article that mentioned the same 63 survey participants as those mentioned in the present paper is cited in the 'Introduction' section. It is also mentioned that the 'component' of the research covered in that paper was different from those of the present paper. (Lines 111-114) References no: 10 & 11 (Lines 342-347)
Executive Editor's decision: Revision Required	
ROUND 2	
Responsible Editor's name: Mohammed Saiful Islam Bhuiyan	
ORCID: 0000-0001-8532-4992	
Comments sent to author (Date: 29-Jul-24)	Date: 31-Jul-24
1. Please cite the published part of the work in the methods section not in the introduction, and it would be better to omit reference number 10 (thesis).	The published part of the work section is cited in the methods section as mentioned; This descriptive and cross-sectional research involved a questionnaire-based survey using 'Google Form' through email. It was a part of a post-graduate thesis research having several components. One component representing experiences of the Bangladeshi Anatomy teachers regarding use of mnemonics in teaching-learning with the same (63) number of participants. (Lines 119-122) References no: 10 omitted as recommended.
Responsible Editor's recommendation: Revision Required	

B. Editorial decision	Date: 31-Jul-24
Final editorial decision: Accepted	