

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_109629</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>How to Read and Interpret a Scientific Article</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The audience is limited since the article seems to provide a basic understanding of how to read scientific research. Although the author(s) state the need for such an article, I have doubts about whether researchers will find the article useful.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title fits the overall object and topic of the manuscript.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive enough for the manuscript. Since the manuscript is an informative paper, there is no need for a detailed description of methodology.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate for the article.</b></li> <li>5. <b>There is little to no empirical research in the article. As far as how to read a scientific paper, the manuscript is correct in identifying various sections of a research paper as well as the usual content of such sections. The authors even go as far as to include suggested questions to think about while reading a research article.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are sufficient.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes the language/English quality is what I would expect from an academic paper.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paragraph in section 2, <b>Article types</b> needs to be revised. Several sentences do not make grammatical sense. It appears as though sentences were combined somehow. Perhaps during an earlier revision. The paragraph is below. The bold text should be revised for readability and clarity.</p> <p><b>2. ARTICLE TYPES</b></p> <p>Scientific articles are classified into primary, secondary, or tertiary articles. Primary articles include original articles, brief reports or communications, and case reports. Secondary sources include systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses, letters to the editor, and research methodology articles. Finally, tertiary articles include narrative reviews, scientific letters, and editorials [4]. Original articles are the most commonly published articles. <b>For an original article to be published in a scientific journal, an original article must present and written in a clear language that is understandable even to readers outside the medical field. They should also be replicable by the reader and well-structured to facilitate easy access to information. The results of the study should answer the research question and fulfill the purpose of the work. Accordingly, we will provide details on the structure and different sections of a research article.</b> results that have not been previously published but may have been reviewed. They must be short, comprehensive, and written in a clear language that is understandable even to readers outside the medical field. They should also be replicable by the reader and well-structured to facilitate easy access to information. The results of the study should answer the research question and fulfill the purpose of the work. Accordingly, we will provide details on the structure and different sections of a research article.</p>	

[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>John Jasina</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Claflin University, USA</b>