

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_120853
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Performance of AD 0.5 ml Syringes: A Comprehensive Overview in Compliance with EUMDR, ISO 13485, USFDA and MDSAP Guidelines
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I like the manuscript as it addresses the critical aspects of syringe compliance with various standards. It ensures the medical standards are met stringently. Additionally, it provides the performance in both quantitative and qualitative formats, leading to greater insights.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Although the title conveys the article's focus on assessing compliance with regularity, it can have a more engaging title. Assessing compliance and performance of AD 0.5 ml syringes: A comprehensive review of global standards	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It needs some minor adjustment in few sections. Background: might include a brief statement about the importance of syringe performance on patient outcomes to highlight why this research is extremely important. Methods: Can include some statistical methods used and can delete the healthcare personnel number. Results: Need to clarify the 0.00% failure rate for qualitative and quantitative results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The study adheres to strict global standards, ensuring the 0.5ml syringes meet high safety and performance results. The use of both qualitative and quantitative data collection strengthened the study, and enhanced through reliability and usability findings. The large sample size and detailed feedback from healthcare professionals further affirmed the manuscript's scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	Although the references are recent and relevant, a lot of them are taken from ISO, but might be helpful to add a few from other sources Please look into FDA guidelines or industry reports related to syringes that might improve insights into this study	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjaana Rahman
Department, University & Country	Cornell University, Saudi Arabia