

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_98621
Title of the Manuscript:	Entry Requirements as a Predictor of Academic Performance in Semester and State Licensing Examination. A Case Study at Nursing and Midwifery Training College, Dunkwa-On –Offin, Central Region, Ghana
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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/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		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<p>The article appears to be part of the scientific community as it follows a structured format commonly used in academic research, such as stating the introduction, objectives, methodology, results, conclusion, and recommendations. It also includes statistical analysis, references to previous research, and keywords that identify the scope of the study.</p> <p>Yes, The title of the article seems to be suitable and informative.</p> <p>abstract is informative, it may not be considered comprehensive enough for readers seeking a detailed understanding of the study.</p> <p>Yes, subsections and structures of manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, references seems updated and sufficient</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, there are any major grammatical or syntactical errors while reviewing the article.	
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:	Marwa Mamdouh Shaban
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt