



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_44773</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Factors Affecting Attitude and Behaviour towards Organ Donation among Medical Students in Melaka-Manipal Medical College: A Cross-Sectional Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Manuscript is quite interesting and seems technically sound. Authors should address the followings: The country should be included in the title.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> Aim and not aims. Aim should capture manuscript tentative title. Grammatical errors noticed here. Please correct. Significant risk factors should carry their respective P values and those not significant as well. A statement is required at the conclusive part as a recommendation. <b>Keywords:</b> Authors should use words that appeared on the title or those critical to the study. <b>Introduction:</b> Check for gross grammatical and syntax errors. The aim at the end of the introduction should capture the modified title.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> Repetition of objectives here. Please expunge. Introduce all acronyms before using them. The methodology should be break down to sub headings. Which of the statistical software version did you use? Check for typographical and grammatical errors.</p> <p><b>Results</b> Start results with words and not roman numerals. Percentages should be round off to one decimal place. Since (%) is defined at the headings, no need of representing them in each result. Description of results is very cumbersome. Here you only need the summary of results before presenting tables. Find a better way of representing Bar charts. What is high and low scores? Discussion should be sequentially presented following results format. Relate each parameter (outcome) to previous and similar studies. No conclusion and recommendation in your study. Was the Research approved by a research ethic committee?</p>	<p>Thank you for the thoughtful and constructive feedback.</p> <p>Included country in the title.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> We have made the necessary corrections. All the risk factors mentioned in the abstract do carry their respective P values. We added a recommendation in the conclusion.</p> <p><b>Keyword</b> Changed to words that are part of the title</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Necessary changes were made. The aim at the end was also modified.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> Added various subheadings in the methodology All acronyms were already introduced in the original manuscript. Statistical software was mentioned in the original manuscript.</p> <p><b>Results</b> Rounded off percentages to 1 decimal place. We changed the charts to neater and clearer ones. High and low scores were defined and described in the methodology in the original manuscript. Conclusion and recommendation was done. It was mentioned in the original manuscript that the research was approved by the college Ethics Committee.</p> <p>All the adjustments and changes made were highlighted in the revised version.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>References should be based on Journal guideline. No need of including questionnaire sample here except it's part of the Journal guideline.</p>	<p>Questionnaire was removed. References was done based on the template provided by Science Domain</p>

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)	