# Review of: "Which Attributes Explain Gender Differences in Impostor Syndrome Scores in Medicine and Health Sciences Students: A Secondary Multivariate Analysis"

Derling Jose Mendoza Velazco[1]

1 Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo, Ecuador

Title and Abstract

The title is clear and precise, which helps readers understand the study's focus. The abstract is informative and effectively summarises the main findings, although it could benefit from a more structured approach, such as including a description of the key methods and practical implications.

Introduction

The introduction adequately establishes the context by highlighting the importance of Impostor Syndrome (IS) in medical and health sciences students. However, the structure is somewhat dense in terms of background information, and it could benefit from a clearer separation between previous literature and the study's justification. While previous studies are mentioned, a deeper exploration of how this research expands the existing knowledge would improve the presentation.

Methods

The use of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is well justified, given the objective of analysing gender-specific differences. However, there could be more detail on how the sample was selected and how the relevant gender attributes were determined. A clearer explanation of how the study controlled for possible confounding variables would be useful. Furthermore, a more detailed description of the questionnaire's validation process would enhance methodological transparency.

Results

The results are adequately presented and detailed, but the data in tables can be overwhelming without a clearer summary to contextualise the main findings before presenting detailed figures. A more strategic use of graphs could make the findings more accessible to readers.

Discussion

The discussion appropriately addresses the implications of the findings and suggests potential interventions to address gender differences in IS. However, the study's limitations, such as the self-reported nature of the data and the potential non-generalisation of results beyond health fields, could be explored further. Additionally, strengthening suggestions for future research would help consolidate the findings.

Conclusion

The conclusion is solid and appropriately highlights the importance of the findings. However, a more specific discussion about the direct practical applications in medical education and planning interventions based on these findings would be beneficial.

Strengths of the Manuscript

It addresses a relevant and underexplored topic in the field of medical education.

Appropriate use of advanced statistical methods.

Proposes specific interventions based on the results.

Areas for Improvement

Methodological Clarity: Provide more detail on participant selection and controlling for variables.

Presentation of Results: Use graphs or visualisations to simplify data interpretation.

Exploration of Limitations: Place more emphasis on the limitations and offer concrete recommendations for future research.

Practical Applications: Further elaborate on how these findings can be applied in educational and clinical settings.