

Peer Review

Review of: "An Attempt to Explain Why There Are No Psychology Courses in the School Curricula of Nearly All Countries Worldwide"

Carol Nash¹

1. University of Toronto, Canada

In this second version of the short communication, the authors have addressed some of the concerns of this reviewer. However, the changes they have made are insufficient to warrant a reconsideration of this piece as science—it remains an enjoyable story to read.

The work includes numerous pronouncements without current scientific research cited to support them. The authors continue to rely heavily on self-citations without grounds for considering these previous publications as relevant. Furthermore, the value of the particular study undertaken of the small number of nursing students in one country has not been demonstrated.

There has been no addition to the countries considered regarding whether psychology courses are mandatory—yet these few first-world countries continue to represent what is considered representative worldwide.

What is improved is the amount of information provided regarding the questionnaire. This change makes the results section meaningful in a way that it was not before. However, to make Figure 4 correspond with question 10, an additional option must be provided to question 10—"I have no opinion". It is unclear from Figure 4 whether this was an option provided in question 10 or if the students didn't answer the question. Please state which is the case in the text.

The concerns of this reviewer with the Discussion section remain. The authors have focused on assessing grand theories of the mind rather than current research on psychology in the high school curriculum.

In summary, the authors have improved upon the methods, making the results understandable; however, the other problems noted in the first review have not been corrected.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.