

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_105134
Title of the Manuscript:	Nigerian Athletes' Previous Training, Practice and Current Knowledge of Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation
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://journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled " Nigerian Athletes' Previous Training, Practice and Current Knowledge of Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation ".</p> <p>I believe that this manuscript should be minor revision:</p> <p>Q1. It is very important to change and modify the title. the title is not appropriate.</p> <p>Q2. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated?</p> <p>Q3. In the abstract, the research gap was not clearly stated. In addition, the authors need to rewrite the study objectives to be more academic writing</p> <p>Q4. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge?.</p> <p>Q5. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted.</p> <p>Q6. Are the methods clear and replicable? Do all the results presented to match the methods described?</p> <p>Q7. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field? Is the data plausible?</p> <p>Q8. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. please add some references. since this is a scientific review, all the sentences need to be supported with references.</p> <p>This study is very beautiful. I liked the sequence and enjoyed reading. Please add more references on similar studies.</p> <p>Q9. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed.</p> <p>Q10. What are the limitations of the study? A description of limitations is missing at the end of the discussion section.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Badr Roomi
Department, University & Country	University of Thi-Qar, University of Al-Ayen, Iraq