

## 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Manuscript is important for scientific community</b>  2. <b>The title is suitable</b>  3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive</b>  4. <b>Subsections are appropriate</b>  5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically useful &amp; could be correct</b>  6. <b>References are old. Some of the references can be replaced with recent ones.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is well-written. Only these two points can be addressed: 1- Most of the references are old, but some can be replaced by recent ones. 2- The p-value < 0.001 was considered significant. The authors did not explain why they are not using the cutoff of 0,05 for statistical significance.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tarig Hakim Merghani
Department, University & Country	RAK Medical and Health Sciences University, UAE