

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMMR_118058
Title of the Manuscript:	Surmounting Communication Barriers Encountered by Anesthesiologists in a Multilingual Environment: The Nigerian Case Study
Type of the Article	Qualitative

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is. In spite of the fact that it is just a case study which does not makes us so much enthusiastic about the outcomes, the results themselves could be implemented by another researcher who, in turn, can include them and/or shift them through his research from individuality into commonality. 2. I would suggest the title without involving the term “surmounting” that can be recommended at the end of the study so that the case study describes those barriers and the researcher comes at the end to recommend “how to surmount them”. 3. Roughly speaking, yes; although it could be better by making it cleaner and clearer to avoid being “vague” as it is now (at least to readers). Scientific language should be dry (facts and figures). 4. Not really, the researcher should follow the hierarchy of the phenomenon so to help readers better understand the phenomenon in question. 5. Yes, I do. More or less, it is worth-investigation. 6. Back to remark number 4, I think that the research could be better if we see some original sources to give the reader background of the study under investigation (definitions, historical and medical backgrounds, etc.) not only further references. Absence of old researches from the study is not healthy in scientific research. Research should include old, recent and current studies. Why can't I see them all here. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes. The researcher just needs to pay more attention to the use of punctuation marks, notably with adverbial phrases, adjuncts and conjunctions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is good but it can be very good.</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:	Sadeq Ali Saad Al Yaari
Department, University & Country	University of Zagreb, Croatia