



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_66307
Title of the Manuscript:	Patients' spirituality in clinical practice: Physicians' attitude and self-reported behaviour at a tertiary health facility, Southern Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

	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	<p>Abstract – Background: it is not clear what the goals of the study is. What are the settings and context factors?</p> <p>Abstract – Methods: What are the instruments used to collect the data? Which questionnaires?</p> <p>Introduction: The following sentence :” The experience of illness or hospitalization is an affliction that is both physical, emotional, psychological as well as spiritual.” Should not be generalized for everyone. Not everybody perceives illness as a spiritual experience.</p> <p>Materials & Methods: The following sentence: “Participants of the study were physicians of various ranks, working in the various departments of the hospital.” What are those ranks? Please be more specific here and list both the ranks as also the departments in which they work for. Regarding the questionnaire: is it valid? What are the reliability values for it? Was the questionnaire in English or other language? Was it translated?</p> <p>Results: Nothing about the “common tools” reported on Figure 1, was discussed before this figure. Is it supposed that the doctors know such tool? Please, give a little of background here. Nothing regarding Chi-square tests and p-values was presented in this section. Either enter the information here or remove this sentence from materials & methods.</p> <p>Discussion: At the first paragraph, authors argue about a “disparity”. Do they mean the frequencies differences (81.5%) to (72.5%)? If so, using the word “disparity” to represent the 9% difference is not appropriate. Authors keep interchanging R/S with S/R, is there a reason for it?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Wording: wellbeing vs well-being – please find a consensus and write this word in either one or the other way in the paper.	
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:	Daniela Rodrigues Recchia Witten
Department, University & Country	Herdecke University, Germany