

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_108859
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of clinical students perspective of the effect of feedback on quality of teaching in South East Nigeria: A cross-sectional study.
Type of the Article	Research article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. I agree this manuscript can bring more interest in teacher's timely and descriptive feedback as one key attribute of good teachers, as well as the role of students' feedback as a factor to evaluate teacher's performance in medical schools in Africa and other low-to-mid income countries. Perception of Medical school students is an interesting approach and so are the results obtained.</p> <p>2. I think the title does not address all sections of the questionnaire. Suggestions of alternative titles: Long: Perception of Clinical students of their feedback value for teacher evaluation, teaching enhancement and of feedback as a teacher's attribute Short: Teacher and students' feedback value. Clinical students' perception in South East Nigeria.</p> <p>3. Sometimes language and low concept consistency cause some strain on the reader. It could be rewritten to help readers to understand the study better in advance.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. I think it is technically sound.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct, though, I would personally like the authors to have also used other tools because students' perception is far from enough to assess the value of feedback, particularly its possible setbacks.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are enough, updated and relevant. Eight out of the 21 references have been published within the last 5 years. They are varied and context situated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it could be improved, though. There are some spelling mistakes (perception) and some minor grammar inaccuracies. However, it is mostly clear but the Abstract which needs improvement to help readers to understand the study in advance without any strain.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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:	<b>Luis Mijares Nuñez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Pinar del Río "Hermanos Saiz Montes de Oca", Cuba</b>