SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_46799**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARISON OF THREE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS FOR TEACHING PATHOPHYSIOLOGY**
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)

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	**1-abstract (need to include methodology and finding)** **problem statement (add current literature)** 2-Literature Review (add any related study on comparison method of teaching and current references, summarize the finding) 3-Method (clarify what type of method QuaLI or QuaTI and design, how the data was analyze? What method/software/manual???) 4-finding (how you triangulate the data?/ validity??)	1- These items will be added to the abstract. 2- This study is unique in that compares the three methods simultaneously. There is no study, in my knowledge, has ever taken this approach. Usually, studies compare two instructional methods at a time. These are discussed in the literature review section of the manuscript. 3- The method section describes this study as a qualitative study. I will add more to it to make it clear for readers. Also it was discussed that the data was analysed using manual method adhering to Van Mannen method of data analysis. 4- Although this was described in the discussion section. I will add to it to delineate how triangulation was achieved. This was a qualitative study and validity/reliability are covered under "Trustworthiness " of data. This was discussed in pg. 26.
Minor REVISION comments	3 methods (online, hybrid, and onsite courses) should be explained in details in the literature.	The manuscript is about 44 pages as is. But, for the sake of clarity, I will add a brief summary on each instructional method.
Optional/General comments	Overall, accepted. Therefore, the methodology part is too general and need to clarify certain issues as highlighted above.	Thanks for your review. I will try to make it more clear and transparent.

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	IRB of the university granted permission to conduct the study. The study conducted in strict adherence to the ethical research standards.