

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_100165
Title of the Manuscript:	Users' Satisfaction Levels about m-Health Applications in Growth and Development Children Monitoring in Yogyakarta, Indonesia
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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><b>Compulsory</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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>There are some concerns that the authors have to consider and resolve as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in Yogyakarta, Indonesia is not necessary in the title</li> <li>• The design and measurement subsections are converted into a single section to make it more general. As well as the same thing with respect to section 2.3 and section 2.4.</li> <li>• The RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section requires some additional points to be more clear to the readers, for example, the authors used tables to illustrate the results, but it's not enough, I suggest using graphs such as bar or cylinder shapes in addition to the use of tables.</li> <li>• The CONCLUSION section should be expanded to confirm the results of this work.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Manuscript language requires checking again.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hussain A. Jaber</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Nahrain University, Iraq</b>