

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_116881
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions and Opinions of Medical Professionals on Artificial Intelligence in Optimizing Healthcare Sector
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>yes, Authors are able for sharing their original ideas and new discoveries with the scientific community as well as to the general population in their review article.</p> <p>Yes, Authors has used a suitable title which includes relevant and interesting title for improving its quality.</p> <p>Yes, but kindly add 2,3 appropriate keywords other than their title of review article</p> <p>Make flow charts also for proper description of their title</p> <p>Yes,It is a scientific manuscript which is organized to reflect the basis pattern of the scientific process.</p> <p>References are not properly arranged i.e 13 no. reference is not mention in their article and in-text citation of tables and figures are not mentioned to acknowledge the source. Kindly mention it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your review. All review accepted for necessary revision.</p> <p>References were generated using Mendeley cite.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	et al should be write in italic font	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	