

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_120216</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Palliative Care Knowledge, Among Physicians in King Abdullah Medical City, Makkah, Saudi Arabia, 2024, Cross Section Study</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This is an interesting paper. There are concerns that the results do not all relate to the Methods outlined. It is unclear how the correlations in Table 4 have been obtained – it is assumed that the questionnaire used allowed these to be assessed, using the appropriate questions. This is not explained and is unclear. The discussion is unclear in places. There is discussion of feeling of participants' training in a previous paper – line 259 – but there is no evidence that this was considered in this study.</p> <p>It is also unclear what beliefs are being considered about end-of-life care – line 307 – and this needs to be clarified</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The duration of the study has not been given The details of the statistics used is not really needed. The overall response rate – i.e., from the total potential number of doctors at the hospital – and how the participants were selected would be helpful</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>These are reasonable, although often the Literature review would be incorporated in the Introduction</p>	
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>There are specific points: Line 91 – the statistical values are not really needed here Line 122 – the total number of doctors at the hospital would be helpful and details of how the participants were recruited is needed Line 122 More is needed about the survey – especially if subsections are then to be used to represent other scales Line 137 Ethical approval should be mentioned earlier Table 2 It would be helpful if the correct answer was highlighted – perhaps in bold There are concerns about the questionnaire When should palliative care be initiated – symptoms are often accepted as a trigger to consider palliative care Breaking bad news - strengthening of the relationship is a very important part Tables 5 and 6 are referenced but were not available to me Line 293 – age may be important as younger doctors may have received appropriate training / education, which was not provided for older doctors, this needs to be discussed Line 307 – it is unclear what beliefs are being discussed here</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There is a need to look at the English E.g., Line 52 -54 is not at all clear Line 75 A90% -A ids not needed Line 152 is confusing; angioedema was the incorrect response but this reads as if it was the correct response Some typos – especially a gap in the %	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This needs to be clarified and changes made It provides interesting information but at present this is confusing and unclear	

**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>David Oliver</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Kent, UK</b>