



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_32767
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME'S (NHIS) EFFECTIVENESS IN A TERTIARY TEACHING HOSPITAL IN SOUTHEAST NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research 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	Method part: 1. For method part, I'd like the author need to add the description of the participants, the participant's numbers, the proportion of gender and age. 2. What kind of variables used to evaluate the quality of the National health insurance scheme's effectiveness? This should be stated at the method part. Results part: 3. I'd like the author to describe the key information of tables in results part. Discussion part: 4. The author use "convenient sampling" method to collect the data, it should be discussed at the discussion part due to this method might has big bias, and is not suitable for Inference to the whole population. Reference part: The author needs to be careful about the reference, there are several mistakes in it, for example, line 192: 3(3):.97-99, it should be: 192: 3(3):97-99. Line 208: "(2016)6:7:1-10 "should be 2016; 6(7):1-10.	The 5 corrections indicated here have been carried out in line with the reviewers recommendations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In table 1, there is a minor mistake in the last Colum "No of years of work as a manager", which should be "Number (NO.) of years of work as a manager". 2. In table 2, it is difficult to understand, what does '6 (75.0)' stands for? It might be easier for the reader to understand if the author could add more information in the first line of the table, for example 'Number (percentage)'.	These 4 corrections pointed out here by the reviewer are in order and well taken. They have been dully corrected in line with his directives.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. The format needs to be modified, eg. "Study setting:" in line 55 should be bold. The format of the tables needs to be modified. For example, use three-line table. (see the example paper for more details). 4. In the discussion, the author seems to use inappropriate word to describe the results, for example, line 117, it says "Only half of the healthcare providers and managers were aware of the hospital policy on treatment guideline", and it indicates table 4, but actually those aware of hospital policy on treatment guideline is not HALF.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall this article addresses a very topical question in healthcare system. But the methodology is with limitation due to the author use 'convenient sampling' to collect data, which could not be generalized to the whole population, this needs to be discussed in discussion part. Besides, the author did not provide adequate information on how the study was conducted. The description of the results is insufficient, especially lack of description for the key information of the tables.	More information has been provided in the methods section. However, the authors do not wish to elaborate standard procedures that are widely known nor repeat results already stated in tables in prose.