

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_88859
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Framework strategy for patient medication adherence and improvement in Medical Healthcare Centre Offa, Kwara State
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract:</p> <p>aquired should be acquired</p> <p>Please give some more detail in the figure captions. What is there is good as a title. But in some cases the numbering for example on figure 3 isn't clear. Or the purpose/ definition of the color coding on Figure 4 are not clear.</p> <p>The paper makes a clear case for why a new model is needed for medication reminders and tracking.</p> <p>The two flaws (potentially) that I think can easily be addressed are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Why will patients be eager to participate? (It seems easy with the app and so on, but there still are extra steps here that some patients might deem not needed) and 2) What happens to patients who don't have any smart devices? I know that even in the developing world this is a more minor concern. But I think the paper could include a small discussion of the statistics of smart devices where this can be used or even a discussion based on the statistics from the Offa study. Addressing each of these directly can only strengthen the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I would remove this first sentence in the abstract "The world revolves around the digitization of the healthcare system;" The remainder of the sentence is the point.</p> <p>I'm not sure what this sentence in the abstract intends to mean "The reasons why patients decided to have harmful medication adherence became a critical challenge in the healthcare system." I think it could also be removed.</p> <p>In the introduction, "Generally, patients tend to recover from chronic ailments if they strictly believe and obey medication as scheduled by medical experts." I would reword to say: , "Generally, patients tend to have improved medical outcomes from chronic ailments when they strictly follow medication schedules set by medical experts." Also I think this sentence could be used to introduce the second paragraph in the introduction section.</p> <p>Introduction second paragraph you say "method" do you mean "methods". Three methods have been listed.</p> <p>Change "determined via Artificial intelligent AI" to "determined via AI". Please consider removing the rhetorical question that this correction was part of.</p> <p>In figure 2 change "send medic schedule" to "send medication schedule"</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>And behaviour is correct in British English, there is no u in the word in American English. That can be kept or removed based on the discretion of the editor.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> I am not familiar with medical ethics. But the only ethical issue I see is discussing the medical history of a patient. Mr. and Mrs. Tope.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ian Bentley
Department, University & Country	Saint Mary's College, US