

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55729

Title: Financial Support Pathways for M.D. Students: Promoting Equity and Academic Excellence

### Recommendation:

- ✓ Accept as it is .....  
 Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

**Date:** 14.01.26

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

#### Strengths of the Study:

- The manuscript addresses an important and timely issue regarding financial barriers faced by M.D. students and the role of scholarships in promoting equity and diversity in medical education.
- It offers a comprehensive discussion on the multidimensional benefits of scholarships beyond financial aid, including professional development and societal impact.
- The empirical analysis comparing academic outcomes of scholarship and non-scholarship students is clearly presented, utilizing multiple assessment metrics.
- The inclusion of relevant references supports the arguments made and situates the study within the broader context of medical education research.
- The paper highlights policy implications, emphasizing collaborative efforts to expand scholarship access.

#### Weaknesses of the Study:

- The empirical analysis is based solely on quantitative comparisons of scores, which may not capture the full scope of scholarship impacts such as motivation, well-being, or long-term career outcomes.
- The sample size, while adequate, lacks detailed demographic information about participants, limiting understanding of the representativeness and diversity of the study population.
- The methodology lacks a detailed description of the statistical tests used beyond T-tests, and does not account for potential confounding variables.
- The paper does not mention ethical approval or informed consent procedures for data collection, raising concerns about ethical oversight.
- Some sections of the manuscript, especially the discussion, could benefit from clearer elaboration and more critical engagement with contrasting findings.
- Minor issues with formatting, such as inconsistent reference style and slight grammatical errors, reduce overall readability.

#### Reviewer Comments:

- **Title and Abstract:** The title is clear, relevant, and indicative of the study's focus. The abstract accurately summarizes the study's aims, main findings, and significance but would benefit from clearer separation between background, methods, results, and conclusions.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction effectively establishes the importance of financial support in medical education but could be strengthened with more recent data and explicit research questions or hypotheses.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** The analysis relies on t-tests comparing average scores; however, details such as the statistical software used and assumptions tested are missing. Additionally, variables such as socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or prior academic achievement are not controlled.
- **Results and Discussion:** Results are presented clearly; however, the discussion over-relies on the non-significant statistical findings without exploring qualitative aspects or potential long-term effects.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** Conclusions are generally supported by the data but should clarify that immediate academic performance does not appear influenced by scholarships, while broader benefits are emphasized.
- **Ethical Clearance:** The manuscript does not mention whether ethical approval was obtained or if informed consent was acquired. This is a critical omission.
- **Grammar and Language:** The manuscript is generally well-written but contains minor grammatical and typographical errors. Attention to language clarity and consistency is recommended.
- **Tables, Figures, and References:** Tables are clear, but formatting consistency with references should be improved. Some references are embedded in the text without proper formatting, and in-text citations should adhere to a standard style.

*Note: Based on the provided content and my review, there is no evidence to suggest that this paper has been previously published on the internet or any other platform. The manuscript appears to be original and not publicly available elsewhere.*