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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	Objectivity Yes The records used for analysis, were already collected details, hence no objectivity found. Utility No The utility value of the study is somewhat missing, as it doesn't say, how can we reduce the problem of poly pharmacy, the authors can recommend the points. And number of studies found polypharmacy in elder population, it is not clear what's new in this research. Integrity Yes No manipulations are possible in the electronically recorded data. Accuracy Yes Case selection and control group selection and matching was perfect, and ODDS ratio and regression were appropriate for this research. The accuracy is strengthened by statistical techniques. Research question and hypothesis Yes Research question is very clear, "What are factors associated with Polypharmacy" hidden hypothesis proved as number of services, co morbidities reasoned for polypharmacy. Methods Yes Research methodology well designed. Comprehensiveness of analysis Yes Clear understanding of analytical methods throughout the research article is appreciated. Replication of study No Already numerous articles analyzed polypharmacy in elder population in a quantitative way. To add the innovation in replication, can go for qualitative research. Contribution of research No This is not the addition of knowledge in healthcare field as many researches found Referencing Yes Properly done with scientific referencing Theory testing/creation/ extension No Not applicable Literature review (missed/under or over referencing) NA There is no missed, under or over referencing Application of statistical analysis Yes Proper statistical tools applied in a simple way. Integration (test of hypothesis/appropriate method used either quantitative or qualitative) Yes If it is combined with some qualitative research, the scope is very high.	

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shanmugapriya Jawaharlal**
Department, University & Country	**Mahatma Gandhi University of Medical Sciences and Technology, India**