



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_50833
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of Hospital Staff on the Procedures and Obstacles to Public Procurement in Ghana
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	<p>1. Line 59 this is the latest Act? No updates?</p> <p>2. Line 106-107, 117 how much in USD?</p> <p>3. Research methodology in thesis and papers are different in writing style. In papers we no need to give much definitions and or comparisons, just more towards straight to the points.</p> <p>4. 191 what are the resources of the questionnaire? How many collected, sampling, valid, analysed?</p> <p>5. Only one interview?</p> <p>6. 251-259 reliability test is so high. Predictable? Justify</p> <p>7. 281 replace Sexes with gender</p> <p>8. add demographic analysis table</p> <p>9. line 311 onwards the analysis is too much positive, guided? Predictable?</p> <p>10. highlight the interview quotes as usual, please see qualitative papers</p> <p>11. what was the rank used?</p>	<p>1. Added it to the revised manuscript and highlighted</p> <p>2. Added it to the revised manuscript and highlighted</p> <p>3. It has been addressed and highlighted in the manuscript</p> <p>4. It has been addressed and highlighted in the manuscript</p> <p>5. Because he is the key informant</p> <p>6. This was based on the responses.</p> <p>7. Done</p> <p>8. Maintained the text as it gives the same explanation as the table.</p> <p>9. Based on the responses</p> <p>10. Done</p> <p>11. To assess the degree of concordance</p> <p>Grateful to the reviewer for improving the quality of the paper</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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