

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_99695
Title of the Manuscript:	Telemedicine: improving healthcare outcome
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Telemedicine Role in improving health outcome -A MINI REVIEW/OVERVIEW YES OKAY as per guidelines; Introduction,Literature review, Discussion ,Conclusion and recommendations. Yes Not proper ;better to use google scholar It is preferable for key words to be in MeSH terms in alphabetical order ,not to present within the title. Less paragraphs are preferable. More depth on the subject is required, if at all possible. Remove the subheading "methodology" and replace it with "technology and methodology."As methodology refers to the process of reviewing studies from Scopus, PubMed, etc.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fine but better to use free online editing services ., There are a few grammar mistakes.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kith
Department, University & Country	Niloufer Hospital, India