



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_29507
Title of the Manuscript:	A PERSON CENTRED VIEW OF AIMS, GOALS AND TASKS IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION.PROPOSALS ON EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING SUBJECTS.
Type of the Article	Review 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction should begin by defining person centered clinical supervision and providing some back ground and why this is important in practice. Not sure who "Michael" was (patient, therapist, supervisor) until I read most of the article. I would clarify the scenario up front before launching into the details. 2. The thesis statement is not met at the end of the introduction. Be more clear with the areas that are going to be discussed. For example, author refers to "un-tangle person-centered view of these tasks". As a reader I didn't feel anything was "un-tangled". 3. In Section 5. A PERSON CENTRED SUPERVISION VIEW ON IMPORTANT ISSUES AND AREA'S reads a little disorganized. It appears to this reader that 5.1 – 5.5 could be incorporated into the sections 2, 3, or 4 and leave section 5 for "Ethical Concerns". 4. In the conclusion, this article reviews and describes...it doesn't really un-tangle. The thesis statement in the introduction paragraph should be re-iterated in some fashion reviewing with the reader what the paper provided. The closing two statements at the end of the conclusion section are good. 5. There were a few grammatical errors and noun/verb inconsistencies throughout the 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	article.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article is an important contribution to the practice of person-centered clinical supervision and it was interesting to this reviewer.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Stephanie Morgan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Texas School of Nursing in Austin, Texas, USA</i>