

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_106641
Title of the Manuscript:	Grievances of Post Graduate Residents in their training
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. The manuscript is important. However, It is not clear who these residents are. On one side it appears like they are trainees but elsewhere in the same document it is like they are workers. An operational definition may be needed.</p> <p>2. No. The title may require fine tuning to expand its meaning in tandem with the objective (s); "The tittle should contain the what, where, how, who, ..." or at least some of these. The tittle may be confusing because it talks about trainees yet in the literature we see workers. The scope of the research require to be clear; the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the respondents too.</p> <p>3. No. The literature search is said to be the only data collection method. It doesn't mention the interviews of residents yet in the sections we see that they were part of the sample. It lacks the recommendations of the study save what is called conclusions twice which perhaps would have been the recommendations perhaps. We aren't told the independent and dependent variables and the conceptual framework is missing.</p> <p>4. No. It lacks flow; we aren't told how interview of some residents was analysed together with the search data. The sample determination and the sample size are missing.</p> <p>5. No. The methodology of data collection and analysis seems to be ambiguous and therefore the results are likely to be invalid. Unless this was a no inferential statistics research, inferential results are missing. The objectives aren't precisely stated and the title and therefore it isn't clear whether they were met.</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The tittle and objective (s) may require to be restated.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haron M. Njoroge
Department, University & Country	School of Public Health, Kenyatta University, Kenya