

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_89845
Title of the Manuscript:	BARRIERS OF UTILIZING AN ELECTRONIC HEALTH SYSTEM IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The "Methods" section is very lacking, in a review paper, the "Methods" section must clearly indicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The search engine or engines used - The search terms (these have been indicated, but only in an approximate way) - How many papers found in each search engine - Criteria for controlling overlaps - Inclusion and exclusion criteria - How many papers have been chosen for the writing of this document <p>The authors change the methods section according to these guidelines The list of references presented is a bit dated, haven't the authors found updated articles in the literature? The authors try to update the literature considered as much as possible The title of the paper refers to the Electronic Health System, in the introduction the authors report the definition of Electronic Health Record (EHR) of the ISO 2005, but often in the paper they talk about the Electronic Medical Record (EMR) and also most of the barriers considered are those that are typically indicated for EMRs and that typically pertain to individual hospitals or wards. In the discussion, on the other hand, we talk about National EHR again. All this generates confusion in the reader and difficulty in understanding the text</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	A deep revision of the language should also be performed	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mauro Giacomini
Department, University & Country	University of Genova, Italy