

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_103434
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Morbidity Pattern And Its Sociodemographic Determinants Among The Elderly Patients Attending The General Out-Patient Clinic Of A Tertiary Hospital, Rivers State, Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, The manuscript is useful to the scientific community. The study's findings have potential implications for healthcare planning and the provision of geriatric care.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "Evaluation of Socio-demographic Factors and Morbidity Pattern among Elderly Patients in a Teaching Hospital in South-South Nigeria," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study.</p> <p>3. The abstract is too short. Need to expand the text and details. It could be more comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is organized in a logical and coherent manner, allowing for clear presentation and understanding of the research.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The sources are too old. There aren't any after 2020. Some don't even give a year of publication. There are also no visit dates to see if the link is still valid.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract needs to be improved.</p> <p>2. A lot of corrections to the used sources are needed (updating, formatting, etc. - to respect the standard of the edition)</p> <p>The manuscript offers significant insights into the disease patterns and sociodemographic characteristics of elderly patients attending a teaching hospital in South-South Nigeria. The findings have substantial relevance and implications for healthcare resource allocation, making it a valuable contribution to the scientific community. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives and design. The manuscript is well-structured, with appropriately organized subsections that effectively present the research outcomes. The language and English quality meet the standards expected for scholarly communications. This manuscript showcases a strong scientific foundation and contributes meaningfully to the existing literature in the field.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tihomir Atanassov Dovramadjiev
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Varna, Bulgaria