

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99690
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ATTITUDE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS ON ELECTRONIC HEALTH SYSTEM IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A REVIEW ARTICLE.
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)	1. The research topic is very relevant and timely. The authors touch upon the problems of introducing modern electronic technologies into the healthcare system that are important from a practical and scientific point of view. The article is of undoubted interest to the scientific and medical community. 2. The title of the article fully corresponds to its content. 3. The summary in a short form fully reflects the main provisions of the article. 4. The sections of the article and its structure fully comply with the accepted standards for writing such works. 5. The article is presented in a good literary language. All provisions are scientifically substantiated. The conclusions follow logically from the content of the work. The purpose of the study has been achieved. 6. The number of references to literature sources (46) is sufficient. As a wish, the authors can be recommended to include more recent literature sources in the review. Most of the sources in the article are dated 2005-2013.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is well suited for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	It is desirable to present several types of graphical display of the indicators obtained by the authors.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aleksey Breusov
Department, University & Country	Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia