

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_96610</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A comparative model analysis of predictors of community pharmacists' collaborative practices in two southwestern states in Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes. This manuscript explores the influence of competitive and information-sharing behavior on the collaborative behavior of community pharmacists in two southwestern states in Nigeria; moreover, it uncovers potential differences in information-sharing and competitive practice behaviors between two southwestern states.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I don't know the necessity to mention H1 (the authors also did not test this hypothesis)</li> <li>- Please differentiate H4 to be H4a and H4b in the hypothesis development section</li> <li>- Table 3 shows "refined" model, meaning you have removed indicators which have low FL. I suggest to also provide the unrefined model, showing all indicators and their FL. Then, you can say that indicators X are removed due to low FL; then you can show the refined model.</li> <li>- Lastly, you should elaborate why H4 is not supported.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>M. Mujiya Ulkhaq</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Diponegoro University, Indonesia</b>