

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_117232
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving the quality of operation notes: effect of using audits and education sessions
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, The current research is Interesting regarding to Improving the quality of operation notes</p> <p>YES</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive but need revision. Please separate different section, for instance: objective, material & method, results, conclusion.</p> <p>No, Please get the discussion for manuscript Yes</p> <p>Most of the references are not update. Hence if it is possible, the author's would be added update references from 2021-2024. Please provide DOI for each article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it's good but need revise as a native in some sections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Please insert number page and line number.</p> <p>2. Please adjust abstract to 250 word count.</p> <p>3. Please provide suitable keywords from MESH? (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.htm)</p> <p>4. Please detached the discussion from results, and compare your results to another studies, discuss about limitation and highlights of your studies in the discussion.</p>	

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)
<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:

Name:	Farhad Moradi
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, IR Iran