

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124855
Title of the Manuscript:	DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE AT A TERTIARY CENTRE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This article is slightly important to the society, but I don't like the presentation especially in results, also introduction should be clearer in 2 or 3 paragraphs, besides, methodology here is weak, not quantified, while using this semi-constructed questionnaire. I would be much better and more accurate if the questionnaire was in structured in quantified and clearer method. Then, building in clear summarised tables.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, It would be better if the authors add, to end of the existed title,  at Hospital Seberang Jaya (HSJ), Penan	
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.	Yes, but, it could be better if it was summarised in less than 200 words. Results section is somewhat long	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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 methodology is weak here, as Using this semi-constructed questionnaire. I would be much better and more accurate if the questionnaire was in structured in quantified and clearer method. Then, building in clear summarised tables. Also, the results should be analyzed in more numerical quantified way, for each question, or item.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, There only 10 references It should be more, and more updated	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but the presentation is weak, unclear, besides the weak methodology	
Optional/General comments		

#### 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:	Sameh Monir Abdou
Department, University & Country	Egypt