

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_97364
Title of the Manuscript:	“The efficacy of high-fidelity simulation-based education in enhancing knowledge among undergraduate medical students”
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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> <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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the topic “simulation-based education” is trending today among many education institutions. Therefore, the study will help those who desire such initiatives.</p> <p>Yes. Its appropriate</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 1 can be/ should be removed from the paper as it doesn't convey any meaningful message. 2. Objectives are missing in the main paper. It is an integral part of scientific writing. So add that before methodology. (in the abstract as well as in the last part of the introduction, the author has written aim of the study; that could be elaborated as a separate part as objectives. 3. The Outcome tool for measurement of knowledge could be brief as it is very lengthy and such an explanation is not needed. If it is lengthy, as it is seen now, it looks like conference presentation, not a research paper. 4. Terms like Our study, Our preliminary study, by our faculty – the use of the term “OUR, WE” should be replaced by - this study, the researchers etc... 5. The Discussion part could be paragraphed as per the objectives or research questions. Since objectives part is missing in the paper, do it and paragraph your discussion on that. 6. Generally, abstract could be written in one paragraph without subtitles. There is no harm in writing in this style with subtitles, but one paragraph might look better. 	

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S.T. Janetius
Department, University & Country	India