

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_98900 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Fatigue, anxiety and depression in Tunisian sarcoidosis patients |
| Type of the Article | Short communication |

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is valuable for the scientific community. It seeks to explain fatigue, anxiety and depression in Tunisian sarcoidosis patients. It discusses the relationship between these factors as far as this condition is concerned. The conclusions suggest that more research is needed in this area. The title of the article is apt and concise. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. It gives the reader a brief information on the methodological processes adopted, the study instruments, the outcome and the conclusion of the study. In general, the subsections are appropriate. There was, however, no section for the review of literature. No theoretical framework was discussed. It would have been easier to understand the manuscript if previous research work in this area of study or the literature reviewed had been presented. This would have determined the direction of the paper. The methodology is good. The results are well presented and well discussed in relation to previous findings by other researchers. The references are sufficient and span between 1995 and 2013. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | The language used is clear and suitable for scholarly communications. | |
| 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: | Evelyn Ekoa Bentil |
| Department, University & Country | University of Ghana, Ghana |