

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96458
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, PRACTICE, AND BARRIERS RELATED TO THE INVOLVEMENT OF MEDICAL AND NURSING STUDENTS IN MEDICAL RESEARCH
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://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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is very important to academic and social fields. The topic researcher is less investigate in many countries in the world. 2. Yes. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. I think that the manuscript, is scientifically correct but is necessary some corrections. 6. Yes. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	I think that the Sample size (70) to a quantitative researcher is insufficient, the results are show this evidence. ` Statistically no significant ` $P > .05$. Other inconsistency is inadequate statistics analysis many sites on tables are frequencies 0, 1,2, 3, very small or zero, the adequate statistics test is Exact Fisher. Is necessary to separate de Descriptive and inferential statistics, here is not well written.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonas Daniel
Department, University & Country	Institute of Public Health, Federal University of Bahia, Brazil