

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_100934
Title of the Manuscript:	Medical Negligence; The Case of the Gambia and Ghana: A Legal Commentary
Type of the Article	Commentary

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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important in addressing legal issues of medical negligence cases in health facilities and in general the scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate according to the general objective of the manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive and well written showing the whole picture of the document.</p> <p>The subsections of the commentary are not appropriate it should be structured like: Introduction, method, result, discussion and conclusion.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient but some of the references are not recent. Remove the 1st and 2nd references obtained from Facebook pages due to reliability issues. complete citations of reference are not used. Eg. "23. Roger v Whitaker (1992)" title??</p> <p>Begins with the aim of the work, better to put the objectives at the end of the introduction after showing introductory concepts to the reader. The method is stated in glimpse in the introduction section instead it should be presented with separate section as method and material. Only major findings need to be presented in the conclusion you should move literature findings to the result sections. Inconsistency of font types and sizes are observed at some portions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality and clarity of the work is very good and understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Originality of the work is appreciable.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Habtamu Solomon Mengistu
Department, University & Country	Wolkite University, Ethiopia