



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_55883
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF WORKPLACE VIOLENCE AMONG PRIMARY HEALTHCARE WORKERS IN ENUGU METROPOLIS
Type of the Article	Research

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 (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>A.- ABSTRACT: - I suggest structuring with: introduction, objective, materials and methods, results and conclusions. - Acronyms appear, in short they are not used. - Grammatical errors... check vocal = verbal abuse</p> <p>B.- KEYWORDS: - revision is required in MeSH, there are words that are not in this thesaurus</p> <p>C.- INTRODUCTION: - Use the Vancouver system well, avoid names in writing. - To which they refer with private. Private health system ?. or other private sector jobs. To clarify, in Chile, for example, there is public and private health - It must be made explicit and made clear why they decided to study this population. Are there previous studies in Nigeria? Because primary care and no other ... that has happened. Clearly specify the investigation problem.</p> <p>D.- METHODS: It seems extensive to add Enugu's geographical location, I suggest synthesizing. They use acronyms and are not explained.</p> <p>1.- Population and sample: check grammar, presently = currently .. is easier for the habitual reader.</p> <p>2.- Inclusion-exclusion criteria: It is not clear to me inclusion criteria (ii Who have been working for the past 12 months) with exclusion (iii workers who have not worked for six months in service)</p> <p>3.- Sample: I suggest removing the entire statistical process, formulas, etc. I suggest placing links where the process is explained. Synthesize</p> <p>4.- Data collection instrument: must include the name of the instrument or questionnaire, it does not appear in the document</p> <p>Also add validity and reliability of the same (put statistical data of alpha or another test that measures reliability)</p> <p>Word pretest is to indicate pilot test? .. pretest is used for experimental studies</p> <p>5.- Ethics: review narrative, many repeated words (department</p> <p>E.- Results: separate from the discussion (title are together). They should improve the presentation of this section.</p> <p>Table 1: Organize upper or lower case typeface, avoid abbreviations the variables must be correctly written in the table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Educational level ... clearly specify nurses are not going to university? - Clearly differentiate variables more than 6 months ago ... 6 months ago? 	<p>Parece extenso</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>– Best description.. What it is??</p> <p>–tribal harassment. What it is?</p> <p>– Place WPV: Inside health facility?? Or center institution?</p> <p>– Types of WPV: NA/P/PS.. do not abbreviate</p> <p>- At the end of the table explain the most relevant data.</p> <p>2.- Figure 1: it is not a figure it is a graphic... indicate the title clearly and explain on foot.</p> <p>3.- Table 3: Time occurrence: dont know or Dont remember? Clear out</p> <p>4.- Table 4: reports an incident yes = 50 no = 25</p> <p>Same table reasons for not reporting = 28 (this result is not similar for respondents who do not report)</p> <p>Likewise for the variables satisfactory of cases = 56 and report 50.</p> <p>Please review these data and clarify</p> <p>4.- Table 4: reports an incident if = 50 no = 25</p> <p>Same table reasons for not reporting = 28 (this result is not similar for respondents who do not report)</p> <p>Likewise for the variables satisfactory of cases = 56 and repute 50.</p> <p>Please review these data and clarify</p> <p>F.- DISCUSSION: I suggest avoiding repeating data from the results, unless they are linked to the explanation associated with other studies worldwide.</p> <p>G.- CONCLUSIONS: Adequate to the study</p> <p>D. REFERENCES:</p> <p>- Few, must increase number of appointments and updated from the last 5 years</p> <p>Correct use of Vancouver, abbreviate name of magazines</p> <p>Retrieved is Available from</p> <p>the writing should be thoroughly revised in terms of its form, substantially improving the discussion and references. I find it a good job, interesting and powerful.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Revisar gramatica y narración	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Varinia Alejandra Rodríguez Campo
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Concepción, Chile