

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_101158
Title of the Manuscript:	Health Economics - An essential armamentarium to the present day clinician.
Type of the Article	Policy 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. This could be a short communication. Nothing much was added to the future literature; however, interesting to suggesting implementing health economics into the medical school education curriculum 2. Title is a bit confusing since it doesn't reflect the content 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Too little the reference list but suitable for short communication article. 7. The authors talked about the importance of health economics in the health care then moved to covid and how it affected the the shortness in health care professionals the n talked about the division of economic evaluations. Authors circulated many ideas causing the authors to lose the concentration of the reader on what the authors trying to foresee what message trying to send.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In many parts the paper need to be edited and proof read	
Optional/General comments	I would suggest to the authors to concentrate on one aspect of the healthcare to be studied from health economics perspective using one of the economic evaluation categories-methodology.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hassan Dib
Department, University & Country	Canada