

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_122967</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Disclosure as a tool for communication errors in healthcare</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	The manuscript is very important to the Scientific in that it highlight the critical issues on patient safety and disclosure, which is a significant public health concern due to increase in medical and surgical errors globally. The main reason why I personally like about the manuscript is the mixed approach to the issue as it provides an in-depth understanding of the issue.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is very suitable. However, I would have loved if it could be "Harnessing Disclosure as a Tool to Mitigate Communication Errors in Healthcare: A Mixed-Methods Study"	
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 very comprehensive and straight to the point. Thus, there is no need for additions or deletion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very appropriate. All sections are highly focused and appropriately structured.	
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.	For me I feel the manuscript is very correct based on the literature used as reference and the personal information collected in the manuscript. More importantly, the sources of evidence used are current and scientifically reliable sources for evidence-based medicine. The sources are also adequate for the paper. Thus, I have no doubt about the correctness of this manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, very sufficient for this kind of paper and recent as noted that most of them are within the past 5 to 10 years with some less than 5 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, very scholarly suitable for communication. The tone and language used in the manuscript is not only scholarly suitable but also professionally and scientifically suitable for communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A great paper with great content that has the great potential to adding value to Medicine and Medical Research by enhancing accountability, transparency and effective communication between health care workers and patients. Thus, I strongly recommend for publication of this manuscript without any reservations.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daniel Lungu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Zambia</b>