



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_8839
Title of the Manuscript:	Physician's perspective towards shared decision making in developing countries
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	LINES 74-77, WHAT INFORMED THE SELECTION OF 18 AND 81 PARTICIPANTS FOR THE PILOT STUDY AND THE MAIN STUDY? SOME DEPARTMENTS WERE CHOSEN FOR THE STUDY LEAVING OTHERS OUT; WAS THERE ANY CRITERIA FOR THIS? LINES 86-91, THE PARTICIPANTS WERE OBTAINED FROM ONLY ONE DEPARTMENT, DON'T YOU THINK THIS WILL AMOUNT TO SELECTION BIAS. EVENTHOUGH NO HUMAN TISSUE OR PATRS WERE INVOLVED IN THE STUDY, THE HOSPITAL STILL NEEDS TO BE AWARE OF THE WORK BY GIVEN ETHICAL APPROVAL AND CONSENT BY THE DOCTORS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE WORK NEED TO BE STATED.	
Minor REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION, 2ND SENTENCE LINES 34-36 IS NOT CLEAR. PLEASE RECAST THE SENTENCE. LINES 52-53, THE SENTENCE HAS TO BE MORE SPECIFIC. THE GAP IN KNOWLEDGE, ARE YOUTALKING OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL GAP IN KNOWLEDGE? THE STUDY JUSTIFICATION IS WEAK, GIVE IT MORE STRENGTH OF THE STUDY JUSTIFICATION. LINE 81, ARE YOU TALKING OF RANGE SCORE FOR THE WHOLE I.E. MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM SCORE? PLEASE REVISIT THE SENTENCE AGAIN. YOUR DATA ARE ORDINAL; I THINK SPEARMAN CORRELATION OR ORDER NON PARAMETRIC TEST WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER TO USE THAN THE PEARSON CORRELATION;	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	PLEASE YOU MAY NEED TO INDICATE P VALUES. PROVIDE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, COMPETING INTEREST, AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION WHERE AND FUNDING SOURCE APPLICABLE.	
Optional/General comments	FINE STUDY. THE AUTHOURS NEED TO MAKE FEW CORRECTIONS AS POINTED OUT.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Baba Usman Ahmadu
Department, University & Country	Paediatrics, Federal Medical Centre Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria.