

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122967
Title of the Manuscript:	Disclosure as a tool for communication errors in healthcare
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

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>It is important to disclose the patient diagnosis to the patient or the caregivers depending on the condition for proper support and also acceptance of the patient to adhere to treatment. Patient's find it difficult to adhere to treatment if they are not aware of what they are ailing from. This makes me like the manuscript since it comes easier to manage the patient after disclosure</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable and is in line with what is being discussed.</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>The abstract is not comprehensive. It has not highlighted the objectives</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Literature Review section was missing and statement of the problem</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>Offers new insight thus robust, It has been organized well and written in standard English this makes it very easy to understand. Data and conclusion are in tandem which shows appropriateness in data collection.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Most of the referenced materials are recent and sufficient for the study</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The Language is appropriate and quality for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments N/A</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Caroline Atieno Ombok
Department, University & Country	Alupe University, Kenya