

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99219
Title of the Manuscript:	Efforts to a belief and decolonize global health
Type of the Article	Short 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.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 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)	1. This manuscript does not contain anything new. 2. No. I believe the word "EFFORTS" should be changed. The article reminds me of a manifesto. 3. No. There was no clarity on the objective of the work. 4. Yes 5. The article raises doubts, it is not clear whether it is a bibliographic review on the subject or a manifesto. So the way it's written I don't think it's correct. 6. No, references are missing. Authors should review this.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
Optional/General comments	The article looks interesting to me. But at times the scientific part is replaced by own opinions, implying that it is a manifesto. I believe this should be reviewed by the authors.	

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:	Sayonara Ay More
Department, University & Country	Pontifícia Universidade Católica De Goiás, Brazil