



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
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	

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	Introduction 1. There is the need to reference this statement "Insurance 34 coverage varies from 5% in most developing countries of Africa to above 75% in developed 35 economies" 2. Last but one statement should be "Evaluation of health 49 care services is essential in tracking and improving health providers' services." Methods Study setting 1. First write this in full and keep it in bracket "NAUTH" 2. Why was Focus Group Discussion Guide not used for the FGD instead of structured interview guides? Ethical consideration 1. Is there any ethical clearance code? If yes, quote it. Data Analysis 1. Why analysing results of qualitative research (interviews) with descriptive statistics? THIS IS NOT DONE! General The authors must stick to either "Healthcare" or "health care"	1. The guide notes here were actually referring to the structured focused group discussion guides? 2. The qualitative in the title was an over sight, the title has been corrected. It was an oversight. The study was a quantitative and not a qualitative work. 3. The suggested last statement for the introduction has been added. 4. We stuck to healthcare instead of health care 5. The ethical clearance code has been supplied as requested 6. The analysis here is now in order because it is a quantitative study not qualitative as we mistakenly stated earlier
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction The there is need to project/write on insurance within the study area.....what exist as far as the insurance exist? When did it start? What studies have been conducted about it? What were found? What new thing is the current study adding?	The introduction has been upgraded in line with the reviewers request. However, the authors do not wish to make it too lengthy but objectively concise while capturing the key information.
Optional/General comments		