

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53481

Date: 21/08/2025

**Title:** Impostor Phenomenon and its effect on Students' Self-Esteem of a North Indian Health University: A Cross-Sectional Survey

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

**Accept after minor revision.....Yes.....**

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	•			
Techn. Quality	•			
Clarity		•		
Significance	•			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti

**Date:** 21/08/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

.....

.....

.....

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### 1. Title and Abstract (Lines 1–25)

- The title (Lines 1–2) is clear and informative, specifying the population and study type.
- The abstract (Lines 4–24) effectively summarizes the study's background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.
  - Line 5 introduces the Impostor Phenomenon (IP) but could benefit from a brief definition for non-specialist readers.
  - Line 8–9 clearly states the study's aim.
  - Line 12–13 mentions validated scales (CIPS and RSES), which strengthens methodological rigor.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Line 18–21 presents key findings, but lacks numerical detail on statistical significance.
  - Line 23 suggests curriculum changes but doesn't specify what modifications are proposed.
2. Introduction (Lines 77–85)
- The introduction (Lines 77–85) provides a strong rationale for the study.
  - Line 78–79 highlights the transition from pre-clinical to clinical phases as a stressor.
  - Line 81–83 connects IP to professional development, reinforcing the study's relevance.
  - Line 84–85 clearly states the aim, but could be expanded to include hypotheses.
3. Study Objectives (Lines 87–91)
- Objectives are well-defined (Lines 87–91), focusing on prevalence, gender, and academic year comparisons.
  - Consider rephrasing for clarity: "To compare IP severity across gender and academic year."
4. Methodology (Lines 93–138)
- The methodology section is comprehensive and well-structured.
  - Line 95–96 identifies the institution and study duration.
  - Line 98 provides ethical clearance, enhancing credibility.
  - Line 101–103 explains sample size calculation using a referenced prevalence rate.
  - Line 107–109 mentions convenience sampling, which introduces potential bias.
  - Line 110–115 describes the questionnaire structure and scale validation.
  - Line 117–121 gives scoring details for CIPS and RSES, which is excellent for reproducibility.
  - Line 131–137 outlines statistical tests used, including t-test, Chi-square, and Spearman's correlation.
5. Results (Lines 140–181)
- The results are clearly presented with supporting tables and figures.
  - Line 141–143 reports a strong response rate (94.8%), with gender distribution.
  - Line 149–151 breaks down academic year demographics.
  - Table 1 (Line 154) shows no significant gender differences in IP or self-esteem scores.
  - Figure 2 (Line 160–164) illustrates year-wise comparisons; however, the figure lacks axis labels and statistical annotations.
  - Table 2 (Line 170–172) quantifies IP and low self-esteem prevalence.
  - Table 3 (Line 175–181) confirms a statistically significant inverse relationship between IP and self-esteem ( $p < 0.001$ ).
6. Discussion (Lines 184–241)
- The discussion contextualizes findings within existing literature.
  - Line 187–189 references the widespread nature of IP.
  - Line 201–204 supports gender-neutral findings with external studies.
  - Line 207–213 discusses academic year trends, aligning with prior research.
  - Line 220–223 emphasizes the predictive role of self-esteem in IP.
  - Line 228–234 offers practical recommendations, such as feedback and safe learning environments.
  - Line 237–239 acknowledges limitations like sample size and data collection methods.
7. Conclusion (Lines 243–250)
- The conclusion (Lines 243–250) reiterates the study's contributions and calls for institutional action.
  - Line 247–249 highlights the novelty of the study in the North Indian dental education context.
8. Ethical and Administrative Notes (Lines 251–259)

# International Journal of Advanced Research

**Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP**

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

- Line 251–253 confirms no funding support.
- Line 254–256 declares no conflict of interest.
- Line 257–259 reiterates limitations due to sampling technique and scope.

### 9. References (Lines 266–306)

- The reference list is extensive and relevant.
  - Line 267–269 and Line 285–287 cite foundational and recent studies.
  - Formatting inconsistencies (e.g., spacing, punctuation) should be corrected for publication.

---

### Summary of Strengths

- Use of validated scales (CIPS and RSES)
- High response rate and clear demographic breakdown
- Statistically sound analysis with appropriate tests
- Relevant discussion with literature support

### Areas for Improvement

- Clarify hypotheses and expand on curriculum recommendations
- Improve figure labeling and statistical annotations
- Address sampling bias and consider broader data sources
- Refine reference formatting and consistency