

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_103379</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PHYSICIANS' RESPONSE ON HAEMOPHILIA CARE IN SOUTH WESTERN NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Overall, the article aims to assess the extent of haemophilia care in the southwestern part of Nigeria and determine the level of experience and knowledge among physicians in managing haemophilia patients.</p> <p>The abstract provides a brief and clear overview of the study, including the introduction, objective, method, results, and conclusion. It could benefit from mentioning the main findings in more detail.</p> <p>The provided keywords are relevant and will help in the searchability of the article. The introduction is comprehensive, providing enough background about haemophilia and its management. The objectives of the study are well stated. The methodology is mostly well detailed. The authors have given an explanation of the study design, study setting, population, ethical considerations, data collection, and analysis. However, they didn't provide information about the sampling technique, the questionnaire's development and validation, and a more precise explanation about the questionnaire's content. These points are crucial to assess the reliability of the results.</p> <p>The results are presented concisely, including relevant information about the respondents and their experiences with managing haemophilia. It would be beneficial to include more details about the statistical analysis findings and to present the figures mentioned for a better understanding of the results.</p> <p>The discussion is comprehensive and puts the findings into context. It addresses the possible reasons for the results and compares them with the existing literature.</p> <p>The conclusion summarises the main findings and implications. However, it could also mention the limitations of the study and suggest areas for future research.</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><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the paper could be improved in various areas to meet the standards of the CROSS checklist. The critical review highlights several points such as providing more detail in several sections, including the survey instrument, response rate, and comparisons to other research, would enhance the quality and comprehensibility of the paper. Similarly, attention to the distribution of participants, clearer engagement with existing literature, a more comprehensive discussion, and inclusion of graphical representations would also significantly enhance the value of the study.</p> <p>Some of the graphs need to be modified.</p>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. Joseph John</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Christian Medical College &amp; Hospital, India</b>