Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medicine and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMAH_86728**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Medication Reconciliation in Surgical Patient admitted at Tertiary Care Hospital of Northern India**
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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	This is an original and important study on this treatment phenomenon. However, it requires more contextualization and conceptualization. 1. The author(s) should address comments/observations made in the reviewed/attached document promptly. 2. The author(s) should follow Journal-specific guidelines for manuscript setting. 3. The Introduction should be clearly written to allow the readers' comprehension especially those not from this field. My observations on the reviewed document highlight missing important information in this section for clarity. 4. Required and real (what is happening at the hospital) characteristics of the Medication Reconciliation program/process should be sufficiently presented to allow the evaluation stated in the study objective. This should inform the rest of the manuscript sections. 5. Whenever possible, use paragraphs rather than hanging lines/sentences. 6. Methodology needs attention to portray what the researcher(s) did to carry out this study and allow replicability. 7. Additional information is need on what is presented in Table1. As it stands now, calls for questions on tool's validity. 8. Results presented do not support discussion, conclusions and recommendations made. Tis should be carefully corrected. 9. Much of the discussion, conclusions, and recommendations made are not findings-based. As a result, the manuscript stands weak for the objective it is claimed to meet. **I propose the author(s) rework on this manuscript as suggested and resubmit for re-review.**	
Minor REVISION comments	Manuscript review highly recommended.	
Optional/General comments	None!	

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:	**Switbert R. Kamazima**
Department, University & Country	**Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania**