



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_45602
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF WATER-PIPE SMOKING AND ITS ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG ARAB STUDENTS IN MALAYSIA
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 introduction has so many headings, some of which have only one sentence under it. These can be merged under fewer headings for a more positive reading experience. Under Introduction 1. Previous Studies, for the whole sub topic only one reference is used. The discussion is poorly written and does not showcase the beauty of the work. The authors should discuss the reasons underlying the results they have observed. Not just repeating results. The authors should clearly define what they mean by poor and good knowledge. All other corrections, questions and suggestions are found in the comment section of the work The approved format for referencing should be used	Attended to and highlighted. More references added, discussed and highlighted. There exists a dearth of research in this Topic which is the reason. Still, results obtained in our studies make appropriate comparisons with research elsewhere. Yet, we have attempted to add depth to and elaborate under Discussion following the esteemed Reviewer's comment. Highlighted. "poor and good knowledge" has been more clearly defined now and highlighted. Approved format for referencing is now adopted.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	