

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_83434
Title of the Manuscript:	REVIEW OF LITERATURE: THE ROLE OF ARBITRATION FUNCTIONS IN RESOLVING HEALTH MALPRACTICES
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.journali-srr.com/index.php/I-SRR/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The manuscript must be submitted for proofreading. Too much grammatical error, punctuation issues, long sentences, words with uppercase although it is not special nouns, long paragraphs.2) Title – Redundancy of word 'role' and 'function.' Need to revise the title3) Abstract – Must include the significance of the study.4) Introduction – Must include the main research question, the importance of the study, the gap that the study intends to close, the structure of the paper.5) Method – Explain the relevancy of using PICO6) The study uses SLR as a methodology, however, the author does not disclose the systematic review process, the set of keywords/search strings that represent the topical query. Only 7 relevant articles out of 230.7) Data synthesis must include the reviewing criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) before identifying the number of articles reviewed. Data extraction analysis must be explained in detail as it is a crucial part of SLR.8) Research data – the data must be in a single table and not a separate table for each article.9) The discussion is not well organised and presented. Some of the paragraphs contained two issues that are not connected to each other.	Attached
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Research result – the result can be discussed according to the categories such as advantages/limitations of arbitration for medical malpractices, regulation for medical arbitration, etc. The discussion will look more organized.2) Suggestion for main research objective – this study attempt to analyze the existing literature on the role of arbitration in resolving health malpractices.3) Conclusion – suggestion for future review4) The paper contributes a good insight into the corpus of knowledge on resolving medical malpractices. However, there is a lack of in-depth analysis that can be remedied during the correction stage	

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