



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_64112  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Ayushman Bharat: An Ethical Analysis of the World's Biggest Health Scheme</b> |
| 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>Abstract and introduction should state the goal of the article.</p> <p>Data displayed at figure 2 cannot be found on the reference number 2.</p> <p>There are many English issues to be corrected. The text could certainly be very much improved with qualified assistance in this matter.</p> <p>The method used to the review of literature should be described. The number of articles referenced in the review section seem very few, even though this small amount could be justified by the research criteria.</p> <p>There are citations lacking its complete reference. See: "the budget session of the 2018-19"; "National Survey Sample (NSS)" and "Sustainable Development Goals" (WHO).</p> <p>At the conclusion, the author states that there "are major challenges that need to be addressed to enable the Indian population to understand these benefits". Those should be described along the article.</p>                              |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>The author should better specify on which parameters lays the affirmation that the "scheme is the biggest health care scheme of the world"; and on what data (properly referenced) it is based. Considering the covered population of 107 million, it is not wider than Brazil's Health system, which provides universal coverage for 211 million people.</p> <p>The complete name of three abbreviations couldn't be found: GDP, UHC, RSBY.</p> <p>On page 3, second paragraph, the word "optimal", referring to the quality of wellbeing services, among India's main health problems seems confusing. As well as that last sentence of the same paragraph, which implies the system should use the people.</p> <p>In order to make the text clearer for people from all over the world, I suggest that the monetary values are shown with its equivalence to US Dollars or Euros. Also, the use of "crore" does not seem clear in many countries.</p> |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>The article brings useful and relevant information despite the questions mentioned above. I would be happy to recommend its publication as soon those issues are solved.</p>   |  |



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b><i>Nelson Falcão de Oliveira Cruz</i></b>               |
| Department, University & Country | <b><i>Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i></b> |