

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_103010</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Association between type of school, level of study and learning preferences of Nursing students in Schools of Nursing in Anambra state</b>
Type of the 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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><i>The choice of the topic is appropriate as it considers the association between type of school, level of study and learning preferences of nursing students. However, the importance of this topic has not been well discussed which would hamper the reader's understanding.</i></p> <p><i>Though the title is relevant, rewording would be appreciated.</i></p> <p><i>The Abstract gives the necessary information, but as an academic piece of work, this would require demonstrating appropriate academic writing skills.</i></p> <p><i>The headings have both uppercase and lowercase letters. Subsections are relatively appropriate. Inclusion criteria-not very clear. Limitations of this study would have been mentioned.</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Would require proofreading as there are some grammatical errors and errors in sentence formation.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>There needs to be a logical flow of the presentation</i></li> <li>- <i>A good level of academic standard is expected.</i></li> <li>-</li> <li>- <i>A scrupulous process of sampling techniques was in place, however, picking up 'Yes' or 'No' and then confirming the willingness of participants would require justification. Some areas are vaguely described without discussing in detail.</i></li> <li>- <i>Is there any statistical method adapted to select a specific number of students from each level? What is the percentage of participants from each level?</i> <i>Eg., The level of studies such as 100,200 is not clearly discussed compared to the standard level/year of study followed globally. The analysis and findings were just described and not discussed.</i></li> <li>- <i>Discussion- requires an in-depth exploration of the topic considered. Learning preferences could have been explored in detail with an appropriate association.</i></li> <li>- <i>Recommendation is not very pertinent- 'Preparation of Nursing Curriculum that utilizes more active strategies to accommodate the diverse learning preferences of the students in their different levels of studies'.</i> <i>In this essay, there was no discussion made on the strategies suggested in the current curriculum and how the researcher would recommend implementing them in the future.</i></li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shyla Richard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of East London, United Kingdom</b>