

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	

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)					
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, (it may be revised as Perceptions and Views of Medical Professionals on Artificial Intelligence in Optimizing Healthcare Sector.</p> <p>Yes, but suggested to remove all the subheadings(Background, Methods, Result, Conclusion) in abstract.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Its sufficient.</p>	<p>Thank you for the meticulous review</p> <p>The use of “Opinion” in the title was based on validated research instrument to assess perception and opinion in which “views” may not apply in this regard.</p> <p>Thanks once again</p>					
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>						
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. In table III , suggested to provide the expansion of these terms.</p> <table><tr><td>SA (%)</td><td>A (%)</td><td>UN (%)</td><td>D (%)</td><td>SD (%)</td></tr></table> <p>2. Suggested to add the Formulas used in the tables, for better understanding.</p>	SA (%)	A (%)	UN (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	
SA (%)	A (%)	UN (%)	D (%)	SD (%)			

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)	