

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_102241
Title of the Manuscript:	Patients' Satisfaction regarding Dietary Service at Tertiary Hospitals
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Not so important</b></p> <p><b>Title is OK. However, data analysis and methodology is not proper.</b></p> <p><b>Not proper. Conclusion drawn are not supported by the data.</b></p> <p><b>Not appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>Not correct. See my comments.</b></p> <p><b>OK</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim of the paper is to describe the satisfaction of the dietary services among the patients, selected from two tertiary hospitals.</li> <li>• The copy of the questionnaire used for interviewing the subjects should be included in the manuscript as a table or as an appendix.</li> <li>• The authors have used only 9 items, distributed over Table 1 and Table 2. They can be shown in one Table. It is better to give a composite score to these items and then conclusions should be drawn accordingly.</li> <li>• Surprisingly, in Table 3, the answers to items are sought only in Yes/No.</li> <li>• In order to pool the scores for all the items, the item with yes to be given the score of 2.0 and the item with no to be given as score 4. Include them also in pooled score and then draw the conclusion.</li> <li>• The results provided under Fig. 1 cannot be taken as reliable.</li> <li>• The patient satisfaction about dietary services to be obtained based on 15 items used in the manuscript and not based on single question as shown in Fig. 1.</li> <li>• Methodology used and analysis attempted need an improvement.</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>Ramnath Takiar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>