

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_127260
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude, and perception of Nicotine Replacement Therapy among Bangladeshi physicians
Type of the Article	Peer Review

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article underlines the importance of health providers to consider NRT as crucial tool in the treatment of smoking addition use. It is great reminder for Physician to play important role in substance abuse therapy and they can do that by only updating their knowledge	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggestion: Health Providers knowledge, attitude, and perception about The Nicotine Replacement Therapy in Bangladesh	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well detailed and should be shortened in regard to the length of the text(Suggestion at the will of the author	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article was well conceived scientifically and the method and statics sound well are compatible with the goal of the author, however the result and the demonstration need schemas, table and figure for better illustration	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No, it needs few more as I mentioned in the corrected version of the test	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is well used to communicate the author idea to the audience, but it should pay attention to avoid to the confusion trying to over explained thing	
Optional/General comments	In general the idea developed in the article is worthy and important	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yawo Akrodou
Department, University & Country	Walden University, United States