

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_109383
Title of the Manuscript:	Mental Health Training for Health care Workers at Eradah and mental health Complex in Jeddah City
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be significant for the scientific community, particularly those focused on mental health and workforce development. It presents a case study on the implementation and impact of a mental health training program, offering insights into how such initiatives can enhance knowledge, attitudes, and skills among health workers. The findings contribute to the broader discourse on reducing stigma and improving mental health care quality, which are critical issues in healthcare.</p> <p>Enhancing Mental Health Care in Jeddah: Outcomes of a Training Program for Health Workers at Eradah Complex</p> <p>It establishes the context of the study, provides a brief description of the methods used to gather and analyze data, and summarizes the findings and implications of the study.</p> <p>The author did not represent any tables for quantitative study and did not represented the interview related answers given by the participants.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Reference is recent and sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is quite lengthy, which may make it challenging for readers to navigate. Consider revising and condensing sections to ensure clarity and conciseness. • Some sections, such as the literature review, contain repetitive information. Ensure that each section provides unique insights and contributes to the overall narrative. • The manuscript presents hypotheses (H1 to H5), but it would be helpful to provide a rationale or theoretical basis for each hypothesis to explain why these hypotheses were chosen. • While the manuscript mentions various data collection methods, such as surveys, observations, and interviews, it does not provide details about the sample size, recruitment process, or data collection tools used. Including this information would enhance the study's transparency and reproducibility. • The quantitative results are mentioned briefly, but more details and statistical analyses are needed to support the findings. Provide tables or figures to present quantitative data visually. • Qualitative results are summarized but lack direct quotations or excerpts from interviews, which could add depth and authenticity to the findings. • In the discussion section, provide a more critical analysis of the results by comparing them to existing literature and discussing any limitations or potential biases in the study. • It would be beneficial to highlight the practical implications of the study's findings, such as how the Eradah Complex and other healthcare institutions can use this information to improve mental health training programs. • Proofread the manuscript for language and grammar errors to ensure clarity and readability. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The article is well-structured, with clear headings and sections. It uses formal language and academic terminology appropriate for a scholarly work.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Vinod Kumar Mugada
Department, University & Country	Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology, India