

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124582
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE PRACTICE OF BIOETHICS EDUCATION IN A TERTIARY INSTITUTION OF NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is suitable</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 covers the key components of the study,however Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the Background: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The opening sentence, "Bioethics is essential in utopia," is somewhat unclear and abstract. It could be rephrased to highlight the real-world relevance of bioethics in education and medical practice. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>appropriate</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>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it employs an appropriate qualitative methodology—focus group discussions and key informant interviews—which are suitable for exploring students' perceptions and experiences in detail. The use of Creswell's six-step qualitative data analysis ensures a structured and rigorous approach to analyzing and interpreting the data. Sample Size and Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript acknowledges the small sample size (9 respondents), but a more robust justification could be provided. Though two focus groups are within the recommended range, you could discuss more explicitly why this number was appropriate for your research objectives, especially in capturing diverse perspectives. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript cover a variety of relevant topics in bioethics education; however, there are areas for improvement regarding their recency and comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Age of Sources: Many references date back several decades (e.g., Potter VR from 1971 and Wynar Bohdan S from 2007), which may not accurately reflect the current trends and developments in bioethics education. While foundational texts are important, more recent literature is necessary to provide contemporary context and insights.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall a good manuscript which can be further enhanced by making little bit of improvements in the abstract</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Rajkumar Arbind Singh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Churachandpur Medical College, India</p>