



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24848
Title of the Manuscript:	The healthcare safety environment: health workers' attitude to medical errors
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	<u>Introduction</u> Rather a long section written in some order and sequence. However, the sentence constructs in many paragraphs are long, often carrying two ideas in one sentence making readers to pause to make out what authors are saying. For example: the first sentence construct of the introduction. The authors might want to consider making short the introduction section and construct short clearer sentences. <u>Methods</u> Again as for introduction. Authors might want to consider dividing methods section in subsections for clarity. Suggest: (i) The study design (ii) Sampling framework and criteria used for selecting sampling (iii) Data collection instruments and procedures (iv) Data management and analysis <u>Results</u> It would be confusing for authors to use different terms to mean the same thing. Authors should consider using only one term – “respondents” or “participants”.	Sentence 1 in the introduction has been shortened. Other sentences in the introduction have been shortened, too, where appropriate. The whole intro has been shortened, as desired. It was 1,906 words, now it is 1,462 words. Methods section has been subdivided by the recommended subtitles. Results section writing has been reformulated, as desired. The term “participants” has been used



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 1a: provide same information in text what is already in the Table. The authors could consider making only important findings and not to repeat information already on the table. Similarly for Table 1b. Table 2: Need to make a statement on an important finding and not repeating figure already in the table. All the text for tables need revision as indicated above for clarity. <u>Discussion</u> The authors might want to consider subdividing discussion several subheadings to make the presentation of findings in the discussion clearer.	uniformly throughout the paper. Unfortunately, Tables 4a and 4b cannot be messed up with because they are ANOVA sets of analysis and need to be explained the way it is discussed. Table 5 comments have hardly been briefed, as desired, and I wish this won't affect clarity of reading the results by ordinary and non-specialized reviewers. Table 6a and 6b are regression analysis. They can never be left to readers, even physicians to interpret or examine alone. If the reviewer insists to brief them anyways, I can make them three sentences only but I cannot guarantee the quality of the results as perceived by other reviewers in this case. In discussion section, paragraph 2 is already titled "<i>Why young age people are less resistant to burnout</i>". Otherwise, more subtitles have been added to the discussion text, as required.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Conclusion</u> Too long. Require revision. Avoid repeating what has been discussed in the discussion section. The authors did not indicate whether the study was cleared ethically	Conclusion has been briefed, as advised. It was 847 words, and now 545 words. ----- It is already mentioned clearly in line 43-44 in the methodology, now under the subsection titled Data collection instruments and procedures that : “All required official permissions were obtained; arrangements with the participating organizations done prior to conducting the survey.” This statement has been colder in blue in the text to be easily verified by the reviewer. Please return into black font before final proofreading. ----- Otherwise, if the reviewer feels that this is not enough or that ethical clearance would rather be mentioned elsewhere, it could be addressed in between the 4th and 5th Ines of the subsection of the methodology before data collection titled “Sampling framework and criteria used for selecting sampling” as follows: In this work, healthcare providers from selected private health organizations in greater Cairo, Egypt were surveyed during the period between March 2014 and June 2014; their WL, BO, LMX quality and the influences of these determinants upon the healthcare workers’
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		ATEs would be analyzed. Necessary approvals from each participating health organization's administration, and research ethics committee, as applicable have been obtained prior to the study. One-hundred and fifteen ----- If this design is more suitable, please let me know so I incorporate the new statement in place in the semifinal copy to send to the journal.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<u>Abstract</u> Avoid abbreviations. Abbreviations would be appropriate the introduction section of the text.	Abbreviations have been removed from the abstract.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<u>General comments</u> An important review paper in an area that little is being researched.	