

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_102314
Title of the Manuscript:	PATIENTS' SATISFACTION WITH ATTITUDE OF HEALTH WORKERS IN A STATE TEACHING HOSPITAL EYE CLINIC, ENUGU, NIGERIA
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)
<p>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It could be an interesting manuscript within the medical articles referring to patient's satisfaction who has been treated in a medical center. 2. No. The current title refers only to satisfaction with the attitude of health workers. Alternative title: Patients' satisfaction with; attitude of health workers, doctor's explanation, time spent with doctor and perception of privacy in an eye clinic in Enugu, Nigeria. 3. Yes. The abstract is comprehensive and well structured 4. Yes. Subsections and structure are appropriate 5. Yes, it is scientifically correct 6. References are sufficient and most are recent except for references number 3 and 17. Reference 17 could be deleted at the end of the sentence: "Overall patients' satisfaction with services provided in a health facility largely depends on the attitude of doctors. ^{5,17} " and keep only reference 5 which is much more contemporary. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. It is suitable. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the discussion, results of the study are compared only with a similar study conducted in 2017 in a tertiary hospital located in the same city. Maybe patients' satisfaction study in a different place or different country could be compared as well.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Félix Martínez Juste
Department, University & Country	Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Spain