

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_85235
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Organ Donation and Transplantation: Cross sectional study among Ha'il City community, Saudi Arabia.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.6

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>Title of Manuscript: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should state the year of the study conducted <p>Abstract: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The background and objectives are too long, emphasize should be on the Method and Result section Method: What type of the study ?. Any sample size calculation done ?. or the investigators should justify the size of 406 participants. Result: Should also highlighted the findings of perception and attitude. Conclusion not very convincing as the last sentence is not part of the study findings <p>INTRODUCTION:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Too short and the author highlighted the Organ donation in the world (other countries). Followed by the prevalence of organ donation in the state. The second issues must be highlighted are the awareness, perception and altitude or organ donation (refer to your title). <p>METHOD:not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The method section is too weak and the author should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Type of study Time of the study done. Ares of study conducted Study respondents Instruments used Data collection method How the informed consent was obtained <p>RESULTS: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The authors should highlighted the important findings only. The table already self explanatory. Too many Table and Figure I can be included in Table II. While, Table IV can combine with Table III. <p>DISCUSSION: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This section should discuss the findings of the study and not repeated the findings from the results section. The authors should discuss the awareness, perception, altitude in seperate paragraph. Limitation should include in this section <p>CONCLUSION RECOMMENDATION: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not very convincing and recommended not to include the findings data in this section Last sentence of recommendations is not a recommendation. <p>REFERENCES:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The reference must follow the index medicus style of reference writing. (refer on how to write abbreviation for journal) 	<p>Thanks for your comments</p> <p>Title could not be changed since it was recorded in the university of Hail, but the year was already included in the material section</p> <p>Abstract part : Done</p> <p>Introduction part: Done</p> <p>Method part: Done</p> <p>Results part: A statistician was the designer of these tables, and it's too late to change the tables since the statistics was correct.</p> <p>Discussion part: Already there were separate paragraphs of awareness, attitude and perception with their discussion. We discuss our results with others.</p> <p>Conclusion part: Done</p> <p>Last sentence of recommendation is an encouragement of His Majesty the King of KSA and his trusted Crown Prince to donate their organs after death.</p> <p>References: Done</p> <p>Many thanks and regards</p>

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript entitled " Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Organ Donation and Transplantation: Cross sectional study among Ha'il City community, Saudi Arabia" was not very clear and well-conceived. Several problems were identified.	

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>	This study had been reviewed and approved by the research Ethics Committee (REC) at the University of Ha'il and approved by the University president. The research project was numbered H-2021-202 and dated 01-11\2021. Participants in the study were informed that their participation was voluntary, and that their contribution was of great value. No personal identifiers were collected. All authors declared that informed consent was obtained from the participants for publication of this original article.