

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_120000
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on Telemedicine: Benefits and Pitfalls
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community because telemedicine can be a way to provide medical services for people who are difficult to transport or even cannot be transported for medical reasons or in the case of a possible pandemic like the Covid 19 pandemic.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is well done and comprehensive.</li> <li>4. Yes, the structure and subsection of the manuscript are appropriate for a review article.</li> <li>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references are relatively sufficient (20 references) and just one references is under the year 2000. Bolam, 1957 and Arnold and Stern, 2006 are not included in the bibliographical references!</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please ask the author(s) to arrange the text on the page from beginning to end (Justify). I have made mentioned corrections on the full article with the red colour.</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>Mihai- Iacob Bețea</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj-Napoca (USAMVCN), Romania</b>