

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_91044 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evidence-based Recommendations to Improve Attraction, Recruitment and Retention of Health Workers in Sudan,2022 |
| 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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>Modified Topic: "Evidence-based Recommendations to Improving Attraction, Recruitment and Retention of Health Workers in Sudan". The reason is that, this study may be useful beyond 2022 and beside, 2022 is almost out. In the abstract: Replace "we try to summarize" with "the study summarized". Avoid the use of personal pronouns in your work. Methods in Abstract: "We searched online databases, relevant websites and reference lists of selected literature to identify studies on compulsory rural service programs and financial incentives. Forty studies were selected". Simply say, "The study reviewed forty different research papers and other resource materials on compulsory rural service programs and financial incentives". Conclusion in Abstract: "In all the articles we reviewed, policies were in place to retain health workers, but they are not working because workers are still moving from rural to urban areas and from Sudan overseas. Study presented by Lyn N Henderson and Jim Tulloch in 2008 Conclusion Recommendation You alluded to the fact that you have reviewed Forty articles but surprisingly, your references are just 14. You may need to open your statement in the abstract by avoiding to mention the number of articles reviewed because this is your major methodology and source of data.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term political commitment and sustained effort at all levels. - A deep understanding of the cultural, social, political and economic context in which the incentives strategy is being developed. - Involvement of key stakeholders – especially the health workers themselves – in developing the strategy, formulating policy and implementing initiatives. - Integration of efforts between government sectors, donors, non-governmental organizations and the private sector to ensure the initiatives are sustainable. - Packages of coordinated and linked financial and nonfinancial incentives that adequately respond to the needs of health workers. - Monitoring and evaluation tools and systems. - Strengthened supervision and management capacities. - Performance management systems that link health worker performance to supportive supervision and appraisal, and - Continued research on what motivates health workers in order to adapt and adjust the incentives to the changing needs and desires of the workforce. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

Comment [H1]: expunge

Comment [H2]: replace with "the policies appear to be ineffective"

Comment [H3]: in section 1.1, avoid this kind of in text citation. Simply say "Henderson and Tulloch (2008)". The surnames only.

Comment [H4]: How can your conclusion still carry 1.. check the numbering of the segments of your work generally.

Comment [H5]: Number your points.

Comment [H6]: On page 3, either write these points out in a continuous sentence or number them for clarity.

Comment [H7]: Use numbers to high light your recommendations

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? | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes, alluding to reviewing forty articles and citing less than 20 works without clearly stating why some were not cited or ignored.</p> | |

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Emmanuel Aondongusha Asue |
| Department, University & Country | Benue State University, Nigeria |