

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJMAH_121332
Title of the Manuscript:	Medication Reconciliation is Patient Safety and Quality: A Quality Improvement Initiative to Optimize Medication Therapy at Alwajba PHCC
Type of the Article	Shrot communication

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 is crucial for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in medication reconciliation practices, which are essential for ensuring patient safety and high-quality healthcare. By identifying the challenges and implementing a strategic intervention at Alwajba Health Center, the study provides valuable insights into improving medication reconciliation rates. I appreciate this manuscript because it highlights a pragmatic approach to enhance patient care, emphasizing the importance of systematic improvements and continuous quality assessment in healthcare settings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Medication Reconciliation is Patient Safety and Quality: A Quality Improvement Initiative to Optimize Medication Therapy at Alwajba PHCC," is somewhat lengthy and could be more concise. A more succinct and clear title might be:</p> <p>"Improving Medication Reconciliation for Enhanced Patient Safety: A Quality Initiative at Alwajba PHCC"</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction to the Problem: The abstract begins well by stating the importance of medication reconciliation but could be more explicit about why the current rates are problematic. <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention Strategy: More details on the specific strategies and interventions implemented would be beneficial. <input type="checkbox"/> Results: A brief mention of the outcomes or improvements observed from the intervention could provide a clearer picture of the study's impact. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion: Reinforce the significance of the findings and their implications for broader healthcare practices. <p>Keywords alphabetically</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction Comment: The introduction is thorough and well-written but could be more concise. Ensure the importance of medication reconciliation in primary care is highlighted early on.</p> <p>Method Comment: The method section is clear but could be organized into distinct subsections (e.g., Aim, Outcome Measures, Process Measures, Balance Measures, Interventions) for better readability.</p> <p>Results Comment: The results section is clear and concise, but consider including more detailed statistics and visual aids (e.g., charts or graphs) to illustrate the improvement over time.</p> <p>Discussion Comment: The discussion is comprehensive but slightly repetitive. It could be streamlined to focus on key findings, their implications, and limitations.</p> <p>Conclusion Comment: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key points but could emphasize the broader implications for future practice and research.</p> <p>Figures and Diagrams Comment: Ensure all figures and diagrams are clearly labeled and referenced in the text. They should enhance the reader's understanding of the interventions and results.</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 demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness through its systematic approach to improving medication reconciliation practices. The use of a multi-faceted intervention strategy, including educational initiatives, point-of-care reminders, and digital engagement, is grounded in evidence-based practices known to enhance healthcare quality and patient safety. The data-driven approach, with clear outcome and process measures, ensures that the improvements are accurately tracked and evaluated. Additionally, the implementation of Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles reflects a rigorous quality improvement methodology, reinforcing the manuscript's robustness and reliability in addressing the identified gaps in medication reconciliation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References Comment: Ensure all references are up-to-date and correctly formatted. Consider adding more recent studies to support the findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Clarity and Precision: Ensure that the language is clear and precise. Avoid overly complex sentences and jargon that might confuse readers.</p> <p>Consistency: Maintain consistent terminology and style throughout the manuscript. For example, use "medication reconciliation" consistently and ensure that all abbreviations and terms are defined when first used.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: Proofread for grammatical accuracy and proper syntax. This includes checking for punctuation, subject-verb agreement, and sentence structure.</p> <p>Flow and Coherence: Improve the overall flow of the manuscript by ensuring that each section transitions smoothly into the next. Logical progression and coherence are essential for readability and comprehension.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comment: The manuscript has a logical flow but could benefit from clearer subsection headings and consistent formatting throughout.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhishek Lachyan
Department, University & Country	AIIMS, India