

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_112317
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of differences in satisfaction among the elderly utilizing outpatient services at Suak Ribee and Meutulang Community Health Centers
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is quite useful specifically for local community</p> <p>Suggestion for new title: Exploring Differences in Elderly Satisfaction with Outpatient Services at Suak Ribee and Meutulang Community Health Centers</p> <p>In the abstract, briefly add the issue of the study. Add information on how data was collected.</p> <p>Subsections and structure are appropriate ✓</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct but some information must be add to ensure the credibility of the manuscript.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and it is mixed with recent and later years of publications.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The author must proofread this manuscript. There are some grammar issues spotted with wrong tenses used especially in methodology part.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In The Earlier paragraph, you mentioned Puskesmas. Explain the term as some readers are not familiar with the term.</p> <p>In the introduction part, I strongly suggest you to provide a table and provide information on which health centres were involved, numbers of patients/outpatients that came to each different healthcare, years involved as it will be easier for the readers to get the information when they refer to the table.</p> <p>I think the Methodology is the weakest part of the manuscript. Many important missing information and the authors used future tenses instead of past tense.</p> <p>How did you do your data collection? How long did you take to complete your data collection process? How did you approach the respondents as they are elderly citizen and it is not easy to approach them. Did you get any permission to interview the patients?</p> <p>In the measurement part, can you include the items/questions used to measure the variables? What is the Cronbach's Alpha for the variable? Please include the scale used to measure the intensity of the answers , scale 1 to 5 , or 1 to 7</p> <p>In the discussion, why there is a need to include detail of Dian's research? What you can do is to look after the findings and compare with yours. Then, justify your result.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aslinda Mohd Shahril
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia