



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_47077
Title of the Manuscript:	The most cited MeSH terms and authors who published papers in Pubmed Central on the topic of medicine and health using bibliometric analyses
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	The study brings important reflections to the scientific community, presents a good methodology for searching and analyzing the results, but it still lacks a more in-depth discussion about the real contributions of its findings to the scientific community in general, besides not making clear what the implications of this compilation for researchers in the field (how can this data be applied?)	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors must in fact review their discussion session, because of the way it is placed, the discussion only flows as a detail of the metric procedures, it lacks a discussion of a substantial body of reports and information about the importance of these metrics to the scientific community. There are questions to answer: Can minutiae analysis of metrics impact on new lines of research? Does monitoring of metrics produce relevant information in health decision-making? What are the main axes of health care or management that can benefit from the study of metrics? These are just examples of driving axes that authors can use in their discussion.	
Optional/General comments	Add to the discussion text a synthesis of the main implications of the study and / or suggestions for future studies	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatiana De Paula Santana Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Brazil