

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_94998
Title of the Manuscript:	COVID-19 HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS EXPERIENCES IN KUMAKWANE
Type of the 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>Dear Authors,</p> <p>I read the paper entitled "COVID-19 HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS EXPERIENCES IN KUMAKWANE"</p> <p>First of all, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.</p> <p>The topic of the manuscript is particularly important and timely due to the pressure experienced by nurses during the pandemic. However, the study presents serious problems.</p> <p>Here are my observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: The word and is not needed in the Keywords line. 2. The structure and sub-sections of the manuscript are not the most appropriate (need to be simplified so that the manuscript is easier to understand by the readers). 3. The data collection period is not mentioned. 4. References are not correctly cited in the text (e.g. reference No 43 in the text, in the References section is as No 41. 5. Reference No 1 in the text is absent and is mentioned for the first time in the section APPLICATION OF THE THEORY in the paragraph According to Levine and Ursin (1).... 6. In the Literature Review section there is no bibliographic reference. 7. Within the text, references to studies should take the form of e.g. Pappa et al. and not Pappaa, Ntella, et al. (7), besides that No. 7 does not correspond to the correct place in the text and that the names of the authors are not correctly written. There are many such mistakes. You give me the impression that some suggestions were taken from some studies along with their references. 8. You should read some papers published in this journal and/or read the instructions to Authors. <p>Good luck</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In general, the entire text needs to be reviewed at all points and I believe that with appropriate interventions, it can be published.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christos Sykaras
Department, University & Country	University of Peloponnese, Greece