

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_98784
Title of the Manuscript:	The Prevalence of Physicians' Burnout Syndrome in Ibrahim Malik Teaching Hospital, Khartoum –Sudan ,2020
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>)

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Overall Punctuations and grammatical errors need to be corrected</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some content is repeated. 2. The description about the setting is not required, instead brief about the methodology needs to included, in terms of population sampling, sample size, tools used for data collection, methods used, etc.. 3. Results section also needs changes, table is not required to be mentioned, the findings can be reframed. 4. Statistics should not be shown in Conclusion <p>Introduction: Year of sources such as CDC, WHO and Diagnostic Code QD85 is not shown The population of 500 hundred doctors at a point in time seems questionable in a 326 bedded with 8 different wings/department setting The sampling method, tools development or standardized tool use, permission from authors, actual data collection process, attrition, response rate and other methodological details are not clear Basis fro the grading in table 1 needs reference</p> <p>Results The age is shown as 2 and 51 Level of profession is questionable Interpretation states highest response from pediatric department, but the table indicates different figures For association can T test be used, The interpretation of table 4 is not clear The interpretations have to be after the table and not before Tables also need reworking</p> <p>Discussion: the first statement does not seem to be related to the current study The entire content seems weird</p> <p>Conclusion Should not include so much content on findings, instead can include implication, recommendation, limitations, and scope for further research.</p> <p>Referencing style is not proper</p> <p>Overall content needs considerable improvement</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Needs improvement	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Vas De Braganca
Department, University & Country	Goa University, India