

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_128515
Title of the Manuscript:	Patients' perception of healthcare givers services
Type of the 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>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses the critical topic of patients' perceptions of healthcare services, a vital aspect of improving healthcare delivery and patient satisfaction. By exploring patient perspectives, the study provides actionable insights into areas of improvement for healthcare providers. This contribution is particularly important in guiding policy reforms and enhancing service quality, making it highly relevant to the scientific community and practitioners.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "Patients' perception of healthcare givers services," is clear and concise. However, for better alignment with the scientific scope and focus of the study, I suggest the following alternative title: "Patients' Perceptions of Healthcare Providers: Insights into Service Quality and Satisfaction."	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides an overview of the study, but it can be enhanced by adding the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A brief mention of the study area.</li> <li>• Specific objectives of the research.</li> <li>• Key findings and their implications.</li> <li>• Methodological approach in one sentence.</li> </ul> This will make the abstract more comprehensive and informative.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound but requires the following corrections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the introduction section to provide more background and context.</li> <li>• Add a clear statement of objectives at the end of the introduction.</li> <li>• Ensure all claims are supported by evidence, particularly in the discussion section.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are somewhat sufficient but need to be updated with recent studies, especially from Scopus-indexed journals. Consider adding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recent reviews on patient satisfaction and healthcare service quality.</li> <li>2. Relevant regional studies to provide context to your findings.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical and structural corrections are required to enhance readability. For example:	

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid repetitive phrases in the results section.</li> <li>• Use concise and precise language in the discussion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Methodology Section</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the ethical approval part from the methodology.</li> <li>• Add an acknowledgment section to address the ethical considerations and participant consent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b> The results and discussion sections are unique to your work and should remain distinct. Avoid extensive literature reviews in these sections. Focus instead on interpreting the findings and comparing them to existing studies.</p> <p><b>Conclusion Section</b> The conclusion should not include an extensive review. Instead, summarize the study's key findings and their implications succinctly. Avoid new information or citations in this section.</p> <p><b>Formatting</b> Ensure the manuscript adheres to the journal's format. Highlight the revised sections and resubmit the manuscript with the changes clearly marked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Expand the Introduction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Broaden the scope of the introduction by providing more background on the study's significance. Include relevant literature to provide context and clarify the research gap. Ensure the introduction sets the stage for the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Add Objectives in the Last Paragraph of the Introduction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Clearly state the main objective(s) of the study in the final paragraph of the introduction to guide readers on the study's focus.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Mention the Study Area:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Include a subsection or integrate the description of the study area within the methodology or introduction. Provide details such as geographic, demographic, or socio-economic characteristics relevant to the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Remove Ethical Approval in the Methodology Part and Add an Acknowledgement Section:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Relocate the ethical approval statement to the Acknowledgement section. In the methodology, focus solely on study design, data collection, and analysis.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Minimize Review in the Results and Discussion Section:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Ensure the results and discussion section focuses on your original findings and interpretations. Avoid repeating the literature review in this section.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Remove Conclusion and Replace with a Summary of the Study:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Rewrite the conclusion section to summarize the main findings and implications of your study concisely without extensive reviews or reiteration.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Add Recent and Scopus-Indexed Reviews:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action:</b> Incorporate recent and Scopus-indexed references to enhance the manuscript's relevance and credibility. Ensure the references are directly related to your study.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Vinothini C</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Madurai Kamaraj University, India</b>