

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_121375
Title of the Manuscript:	Associated Factors of Polypharmacy Among Elderly Patients Attended at Primary Care Setting.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a highly relevant issue for global public health, particularly considering the aging population and the increase in chronic diseases. Polypharmacy, defined as the use of multiple medications, is prevalent among the elderly and is associated with various risks such as drug interactions and adverse events. This study is particularly important as it identifies factors associated with polypharmacy in a primary care setting, providing valuable insights for healthcare providers and policymakers to develop strategies to optimize medication use among older adults.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the study. It effectively communicates the core subject of the research, which is the factors associated with polypharmacy among elderly patients in a primary care setting.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, providing a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the practical implications of the findings for healthcare practice.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow, starting with the introduction, followed by the methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure facilitates a clear understanding of the study and its findings.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The study design is appropriate for the research question, and the statistical analyses are correctly applied. The results are clearly presented and adequately interpreted. The study addresses a significant gap in the literature by focusing on polypharmacy in a primary care setting, which is a critical area for intervention to improve the quality of life among older adults.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. They cover a broad range of relevant studies, providing a solid background for the research. There are no immediate suggestions for additional references, as the current list appears comprehensive and relevant.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, concise, and free of major grammatical errors. Minor editorial revisions may enhance readability and flow.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To ensure that the manuscript is fully comprehensible and reaches an ideal level of clarity, certain sections may require additional clarification or more detailed information. Here are some specific suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale of the study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: introduction ○ Improvement: while the introduction provides an overview of the relevance of polypharmacy, it would be helpful to include more details on why this specific study was conducted and how it differs from previous studies. For example, what makes the studied population or the primary care setting particularly relevant? 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: methodology ○ Improvement: clarify the exact inclusion and exclusion criteria for study participants. Provide additional details on how participants were selected, how they were classified as having or not having polypharmacy, and any potential biases in the selection process. 3. Details of statistical analyses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: methodology ○ Improvement: provide a more detailed description of the statistical analyses performed. Explain why certain statistical tests were chosen and how the results of univariate and multivariate analyses were interpreted. 4. Interpretation of results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: results and discussion ○ Improvement: expand the discussion on the findings, particularly regarding the observed associations. For instance, detail how the presence of multimorbidities and the use of multiple healthcare services influence polypharmacy. Compare the findings with previous studies and discuss any discrepancies or new insights. 5. Practical implications and recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: conclusion ○ Improvement: include more information on the practical implications of the study findings. What specific changes in prescribing practices or healthcare service organization could be implemented to reduce polypharmacy? Which intervention strategies would be most effective? 6. Study limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: discussion ○ Improvement: provide a more detailed discussion of the study's limitations. This can include limitations related to the study design, the generalizability of the results, and any potential biases in data collection. Explain how these limitations were mitigated or how they may impact the interpretation of the findings. 7. Details on the databases used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: methodology ○ Improvement: describe the "simef" and "siam" databases used for data collection more precisely. Include information about the scope of these databases, the quality and reliability of the extracted data, and any procedures used to ensure the accuracy of the records. 8. Definition of terms and concepts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section: introduction and methodology ○ Improvement: ensure that all terms and concepts used in the study, such as "polypharmacy" and "multimorbidities," are clearly defined at the outset. This helps ensure that all readers, regardless of their prior knowledge level, fully understand the study. <p>By implementing these clarifications and additional details, the manuscript will become more robust and comprehensible, thereby enhancing its quality and impact on the scientific community.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giovanni Cerullo
Department, University & Country	University of Porto – Unidade Local de Saúde do Algarve, Portugal