

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_90725
Title of the Manuscript:	The Public Health Mentorship Programme: An Intervention Model for Scaling Up and Strengthening Service Delivery in Low Resource and Hard-to-Reach Settings
Type of the Article	Research Article

Comment [FV2R1]:

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Summary comment: The key objective of the study was clearly highlighted, and the primary aim was achieved. The whole study can be replicated in similar settings around the world. Important study.</p> <p>Introduction: clearly introduced primary aim of the research, clearly stated key objectives, and outlined framework needed to achieve anticipated outcomes.</p> <p>Methodology: a step by step, replicable and robust succinctly laid out study design. Designed appropriately to answer the aim. Although the general idea was adapted from General Stanley McChrystal's command structure, the idea of incorporating it to the local setting framework to suit local conditions is authentic and is what probably drove the programme to a success after two years of implementation. Inclusion of virtual reviews between participating parties further enhanced positively the progression of the whole programme.</p> <p>Results: Results were stated clearly and appropriately.</p> <p>Discussion & conclusion: Results were discussed from two angles which included both positive and negative repercussions of introduction of new team members during the study; appropriate solutions followed were outlined. Furthermore, results were interpreted into context of the local setting but which could also be achieved elsewhere if replicated in similar settings. The conclusions answered the aim.</p> <p>References: Relevant references were used and key studies cited and referenced.</p> <p>Title: Relevant</p> <p>Abstract: Clearly summarized the results, conclusions and the entirety of the methodology. Key words: appropriately relevant and sufficient.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francisca Varpit
Department, University & Country	University of Papua New Guinea, Papua New Guinea

