

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123148
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Military Medicine Training on the Perception and Future Performance of Graduates from National Defence University of Malaysia
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I like this article; the objectives are good, and it has practical implications. Military medicine training in the medical curriculum will expose the students to a range of medical conditions and emergencies that are less common in civilian practice. Such kind of results will boost other countries also to include training like this in their medical curriculum. However, there are few areas in which things are not so clear in the methodology of this manuscript. I expect those points can be explained by the author or maybe added in the manuscript to make it clearer.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Study design can be included in the title to make it more complete. e.g. Impact of Military Medicine Training on the Perception and Future Performance of Graduates from National Defence University of Malaysia: An Observational 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 fine.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is appropriate. Although there can be few corrections and additions as mentioned below.	
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.	Few points need to be clarified by the author or perhaps should be added in the manuscript. <u>Methods</u> 1. It is NOT mentioned anywhere <u>total how many students were there in those 6 batches</u> which were taken as study population. 2. Why only 90 responses? 3. Why not whole batch was taken as the study participants? (In my opinion all the students of these 6 batches should have been included in the study) 4. Why was snowball technique used? (All students should have been included) <u>Results</u> 1. At most of the places, numbers are given with percentage. Except few like 1 st Paragraph of result. Need to change 2. Again, since we do not know about the total number of students in these 6 batches, we cannot say how many were military cadets out of the total students. The results show out of total responders how many were military cadets 3. Table 1: It is possible that responses were mostly from those students who were associated with military by some way or the other. Then their perception and performance could be affected by their background. 4. Table 2: Personal development is not measurable variable, a positive impact on that could be a subjective perception. So how to assess whether there is some genuine positive personal development? 5. Table 2: Personal development, work performance, career progression is a repetition, could have been depicted together in the table or it should be mentioned clearly how they have been assessed, if done separately 6. Table 2: What is the difference between impact on personal development as a person and impact on personality? This should be defined 7. Table 3: Half of the respondents are from military background, so the perception result could be biased, and the result may not show the correct picture.	

Review Form 3

	Discussion 1. While discussing about other research studies, after first author name “et al” would be better than using the word “colleagues” e.g. Sameul et al....	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References could have been few more. They are just “8” in number. Most of the references are recent ones.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The objective of the study is good and useful in practical implication. But more detailed information on methodology is needed.	

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:	Anjani Kumar Srivastava
Department, University & Country	United Institute of Medical Sciences, India