

Review Form 3

Ms_AJMPCP_123860

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_123860
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, PERCEPTION AND BARRIERS TO THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN MEDICAL PRACTICE AMONG DOCTORS IN A NIGERIAN TERTIARY HOSPITAL
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>**Clarity and Structure**: - *Comment*: "The paper is well-structured with a clear flow of sections from introduction to conclusion. However, the discussion section could be enhanced by providing more comparisons with studies from other regions to give a broader context to the findings."</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Introduction and Background**: - *Comment*: "The background provides a solid foundation for understanding AI's relevance in healthcare, but additional references could be included to discuss the ethical implications and limitations of AI in clinical decision-making." **Study Design and Methodology**: - *Comment*: "The study methodology is described adequately, but it would be helpful to provide more details on how the multistage sampling technique was implemented. Were there any challenges in recruiting the respondents?"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Sample Size and Representativeness**: - *Comment*: "The sample size seems appropriate, but more information is needed on how representative the sample is of the larger physician population in the region. Were there any notable differences between the characteristics of respondents and non-respondents?"</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>**Statistical Analysis**: - *Comment*: "The use of SPSS for statistical analysis is appropriate, but providing more details on the specific statistical tests used to determine significance would strengthen the findings. Additionally, the rationale behind choosing a significance level of $p < 0.05$ could be briefly mentioned."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>**Results Interpretation**: - *Comment*: "The results are presented clearly, but the analysis could benefit from more in-depth interpretation. For example, why do you think there is a gap between awareness of AI (94.5%) and its application in practice (25.5%)? Exploring potential underlying causes could enrich the discussion."</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Discussion and Comparison with Literature**: - *Comment*: "The discussion is comprehensive, but a deeper exploration of the barriers such as 'poor funding' and 'lack of awareness' in the local context would provide valuable insight. How do these findings compare with studies in similarly resource-constrained settings?"</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Limitations**: - *Comment*: "While the limitations of the study are implied in the discussion, it would be useful to explicitly state the limitations, such as the small sample size, potential response bias, or the single-center design. A brief mention of how these limitations could affect the generalizability of the results would be helpful."	
Optional/General comments	Conclusion**: - *Comment*: "The conclusion summarizes the findings well, but it would be beneficial to provide more concrete recommendations based on the findings. For example, suggestions for policy changes, increased training programs, or advocacy for better funding could be included." 10. **References and Citation**: - *Comment*: "The references are appropriate and relevant, but a few more recent sources, especially on the advancements of AI in healthcare in developing countries, could add more depth to the discussion. Also, ensure that all citations are up to date and correctly formatted."	

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:	Sugandha Singh
Department, University & Country	Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, India