

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_104590
Title of the Manuscript:	Outpatients' Satisfaction with Pharmacists Medication Counselling in a Nigerian Teaching Hospital
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:

(<https://www.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The manuscript title is correct. The abstract is comprehensive. Minor language editing of the abstract and the entire manuscript is also recommended. Some interpretations may make the abstract more readable and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The introduction needs improvements. The author(s) should sharpen the study arguments. The arguments behind the study should be made clear. The methods section is appropriate. Tables and their titles need to be changed. Statistical values should preferably be reported according to standard guidelines. More details are needed to understand the tool used in the study. The discussion also needs modification. As a general rule, the objectives of the study should be stated first, followed by the main lessons learned. They are then interpreted in the light of existing theoretical and empirical knowledge. New findings should be highlighted. The interpretation of the results needs to be improved. Conclusions and study limitations as well as suggestions for future research should be added.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor language editing is suggested.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study topic is timely, relevant and useful. Study design, methods and presentations are also commendable. The study finding may make important contributions to the field of knowledge. The manuscript requires minor changes before acceptance.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Dr. Hari Singh Gour Central University, India