



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_36658
Title of the Manuscript:	MEDICAL TOURISM AND NIGERIA'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND ECONOMY: ISSUES AND PROSPECTS
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	The Abstract can be developed to further amplify the fundamentals of the paper. Firstly, the research coverage period should be clarified, as the stated coverage dates in the Abstract and within the body of paper appear to be in conflict. Author(s) should revise the running sub-headings in the paper particularly where results and discussion is used prior to another sub-head. The preferred one should be adopted. Also, Implications, Effects and Consequences suggest different outcomes, so I advise that this sub-head be revised to ensure clarity of content. Also, as required, the specific content should be re-captured under the requisite sub-headings. I also recommend the integration of one or two relevant economic and human capital management theories to elevate the essence of the paper. Relevant charts/graphs can be incorporated into a paper of this nature to reflect some degree of trends, inflows and outflows as regards medical tourism.	1. The abstract has been corrected to soothe the objective of the study 2. The conflicts in dates have been dully corrected 3. The running sub-headings have also been corrected and modified for clarity and precision 4. Specific contents have been recaptured under the requisite sub-headings respectively 5. Some economic and human capital indices have been incorporated to boost the robustness of the study as requested 6. Additionally, relevant data have been incorporated to buttress the trends 7. Additional references were added to support all relevant data and discussions
Minor REVISION comments	The author(s) should revise the paper for flow of thought across each of the sub heads. Also, the conclusion should be derived from the discussions to ensure consistency and clarity. Some issues were overly emphasized within the paper and can be deleted to avoid unnecessary repetition.	1. The paper has been revised. However, we cannot effect all the minor corrections with yellow shading 2. Overly emphasized issues have been curtailed 3. All references have been corrected and repositioned in line with journals specifications
Optional/General comments	Generally speaking, it is a fair conceptual review of an important and sensitive issue for a developing context such as Nigeria.	Thank you.