

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_98334
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE CONSUMPTION OF SELECTIVE SEROTONIN REUPTAKE INHIBITORS (SSRIS) AND TRICYCLIC ANTIDEPRESSANTS (TCA), BEFORE AND DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC, IN COMMUNITY PHARMACIES IN BRAZIL
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:

<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes It is comprehensive All subsections are appropriate. It would have been better to separate discussion and result section. Yes it is correct References are up todate	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Materials and methods section is confusing, more subsections should be added. 2. As stated before results and discussion should be separated. 3. Studies included should be tabulated to reflect major and common aspects of studies. 4. Limitations and strengths of study should be added to discussion section. 5. Conclusion section should include further suggestions to new studies.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lut Tamam
Department, University & Country	Cukurova University, Turkey