



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47967
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the roles of doctors and the functionality of the healthcare system in Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Policy Article</u>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Evaluation of the roles of doctors and the functionality of the healthcare system in Nigeria</b></p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p><b>-Sample and sample size</b> Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>Was the sample size calculated (power, etc.)? The authors could provide all the statistical parameters of their sample.</p> <p>An opportunistic sample can be acceptable if is clearly stated and the limitations of data are taken into account. When convenience sampling is used, it is necessary to describe how the sample of the current investigation would be different from the ideal sample, selected randomly (from the entire population). It is also necessary to describe individuals who might be left out during the selection process or individuals who are over-represented in the sample.</p> <p><b>-Questionnaire:</b> What was the reliability and validity of this questionnaire?</p> <p>In small studies, if we "invent" a questionnaire and do not value validity and reliability, at least we should do a pilot test of it to refine it. ¿Pilot test was done?</p> <p><b>-Discussion:</b> The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies (e.g. by inadequate</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, etc.).</p> <p><b>-Conclusion:</b> It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p> <p><b>-References:</b> The references should be improved.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jose Luis Turabian</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Spain</b>