

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_100557
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND PERCEIVED SUSCEPTIBILITY TO CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE AMONG AUTO-MECHANICS AND ALLIED PROFESSIONALS IN BODIJA COMMUNITY OF IBADAN NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, 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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. This study aims about chronic kidney disease.</p> <p>It is suitable.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>The manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Reference is sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experimental studies and Experimental results are too good with each performance metrics and results. The authors have performed extensive experimentation which is good enough to prove the effectiveness of the proposed model. The authors considered background materials for research in the field of their study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable</p>	
<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:	L. Jerlin Rubini
Department, University & Country	Government Arts and Sciences College, India