



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
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	<p><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.</p> <p>The authors might want to consider making short the introduction section and construct short clearer sentences.</p> <p><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</p> <p><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”.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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.</p> <p>Table 2: Need to make a statement on an important finding and not repeating figure already in the table.</p> <p>All the text for tables need revision as indicated above for clarity.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u> The authors might want to consider subdividing discussion several subheadings to make the presentation of findings in the discussion clearer.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Too long. Require revision. Avoid repeating what has been discussed in the discussion section.</p> <p>The authors did not indicate whether the study was cleared ethically</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<u>Abstract</u> Avoid abbreviations. Abbreviations would be appropriate the introduction section of the text.	
Optional/General comments	<u>General comments</u> An important review paper in an area that little is being researched.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francis W. Hombhanje
Department, University & Country	Divine Word University, Papua New Guinea