

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98191
Title of the Manuscript:	Patients' Satisfaction regarding Eye Care Services in a Multi-specialty Eye Hospital of Northern Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the work provides scientific significance because it is of particular importance for every health institution to improve health services, to monitor the quality of work of employees, through the satisfaction of patients, users of those services. The manuscript fully meets all the criteria of a scientific work. I draw the authors' attention to the fact that in the material and methods part, in the explanation of the questionnaire and validation, the proof of the performed validation and reliability of the questionnaire (Cronbach's coefficient α), as well as the scoring method, i.e. integer scoring, is not correctly given. Yes it is. In the part of the abstract, the authors mention other health professionals, which is a little unclear to the readers. When we mention healthcare workers, we mean doctors and nurses. Yes Yes References should be arranged according to the rules of citation. For example, somewhere the doi number is missing, somewhere the pages in the journal are listed in full and not according to the citation rules etc.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript deserves to be published with the mentioned corrections.	

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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunčica Ivanović
Department, University & Country	College of Applied Health Sciences Cuprija, Serbia