

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95447
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE OF SAFE DISPOSAL OF UNUSED AND EXPIRED PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS AMONG PHARMACY STUDENTS
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for Pharmacy educators to gauge the suitability of current education approach to instill the understanding of the topic – medication disposal. The topic might be irrelevant for some from the scientific community. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Can be improved, especially clumping of figures in result section without text explanations. 5. Yes 6. There is room for improvement for the scope and recency of the references. 7. Figure 3 is perplexing as the error bars were used to describe categorical data. Pie chart or pure barcharts are more accurate. 8. Figure 4: Clearly there is only two options: "Yes" or "No". Display of percentages for "Yes" will be sufficient for the readers, and it will be better if the figures are nearer to the questions rather than making readers matching the bars with the questions in the legend. 9. Figure 16 does not add up to 100%. 10. All figures have to be mentioned in the text. 11. All citations must be in a consistent manner rather than mixing Harvard and Vancouver style. 12. The study design, ethical approval, location, statistical analysis tool are missing. Kindly include. 13. Discussion on the generalisability of the study results is strongly encouraged. The patient population is pharmacy students, hence the pattern of medication use, medication disposal practice might be different from general population. The awareness of good medication disposal practice might be higher among the respondents. The medications used, and the types of leftover medicines are also potentially different with the general population, as pharmacy students are likely young with no comorbidities. 14. Other limitations of the study should also be outlined. 15. How could the study findings correlate with/improve the current education approach among pharmacy students? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Revision is required for punctuation, appropriate capital letters and grammar. Abbreviations must be preceded with full form.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Nil	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> Ethical approval for this study from the ethics committee was not mentioned in the manuscript. Kindly include.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lee Fei Yee
Department, University & Country	Institute of Clinical Research, Malaysia