



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_22692
Title of the Manuscript:	Losing Terra Firma: The case for volunteerism in Surgeons.
Type of the Article	Opinion 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper needs to have examples of the actual procedures that you volunteered on surgery and what were your success and failures. 2. This story can get more potence if married with real pictures. 3. Method of quotation is not seen 4. The conclusion must be put to express the volunteerism effect in the story. 5. You need to articulate properly on the title in the story.	1. Some of the examples of procedures carried out have been added in the article. 2. Unfortunately, I do not possess any high quality personal photos from the event, but I have added a reference with clickable link to the TIME magazine article. 3. Method of quotation has been added. 4. Conclusion has been added. 5. Terra Firma is a Latin term for “solid ground.” It corresponds to the meaning that the article conveys: the losing of solid ground, the shake that led to the collapse of the Savar building to the ground.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Your abstract is quite different with the main story	As the article is less of a scientific attempt and more of a reflective prose, the abstract may seem a little different than the piece as this abstract is not a gist of the article, but rather a prologue to the literal piece. Even then, certain modifications have been made and many points have been elaborated on.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is good review paper if the above comments are incooperated	Thank you for taking the time to provide such a detailed review. I have incorporated the advice and I believe your advice has improved the overall quality of the paper.