

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJRID_ 95502
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES (KAP) OF STUDENTS OF THE FACULTY OF PHARMACY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KISANGANI
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://journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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, I think this research/manuscript is important. The word "of" occurs 5 times in the title. Perhaps it can be re-worded. I believe the abstract is okay. I believe there are too many subsections. It makes the manuscript appear choppy. Perhaps the most obvious example is when the author describes "Selection of Respondents." Then there are Inclusion and Exclusion subsections with short phrases. This "Selection of Respondents" section should be written in narrative form, with sentences. The "Variables of Interest" subsection should also be written in narrative/sentence form. There are other places when subsections could be combined and sentences added, so the manuscript would not appear as choppy and be easier to read. In other words, there are too many places where there is a subsection and then only 1-2 sentences. Yes. Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I believe the quality of English is okay, especially if the author carefully proofreads everything one more time. Note: Beginnings of paragraphs should probably be indented.	
Optional/General comments	For the tables, there are sentences, but then the table captions basically say the same thing, so it's redundant. Should the sentences be switched to the Results section and then described in narrative form?	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jay L. Wenger
Department, University & Country	HACC, Central Pennsylvania's Community College, USA