

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_96745
Title of the Manuscript:	Experience of a Formal Mentorship Program at Saudi Board Family Medicine Residency Program in Qassim, Saudi Arabia.
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. However, the methods section of the manuscript lacks details. The manuscript is inundated with grammatical errors and inconsistencies that prevent readers from understanding the study. 2. Yes, the title is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate; however, the information in the data collection procedures section is inappropriate. 5. No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct. The authors need to describe the instruments and procedures used for data collection so that the study can be understood and repeated. Furthermore, linear regression analysis is used to predict a variable's value based on another variable's value, not association statistics. Please see my detailed comments on the manuscript. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. No, the manuscript is inundated with grammatical errors and inconsistencies that prevent readers from understanding the study. A major revision is required.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tan Fung Ivan Chan
Department, University & Country	College of Health and Wellness, Barry University, US