

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	

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 important for the scientific community as it demonstrates the effectiveness of a multifaceted approach to improving medication reconciliation in a primary care setting. By detailing the use of reminders, education, and digital tools, it provides valuable insights into practical strategies for enhancing patient safety and care quality. The significant improvement in reconciliation rates underscores the potential for similar interventions to be applied in other healthcare contexts, offering a model for future quality improvement projects. I find this manuscript particularly valuable for its clear evidence of successful implementation and its potential to inform best practices in medication management.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Your title is clear and informative, effectively conveying the focus of the study</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 provides a clear overview of the project, including its objectives, methods, and outcomes.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its structured approach to addressing a critical aspect of patient safety: medication reconciliation. The use of a multifaceted intervention strategy, including education, reminders, and digital tools, is grounded in evidence-based practices aimed at improving compliance and patient outcomes. The clear improvement in reconciliation rates from 68% to 87.7% demonstrates the effectiveness of the interventions and provides quantifiable evidence of their impact. Additionally, the acknowledgment of study limitations and suggestions for future research reflect a thorough and reflective approach to evaluating the effectiveness of the implemented strategies. This comprehensive and data-driven methodology supports the manuscript's scientific validity and practical relevance.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Title: Your title is clear and informative, effectively conveying the focus of the study.</p> <p>Abstract: Your abstract is concise and clearly outlines the issue, intervention, and expected outcomes.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction is generally clear but could benefit from improved transitions between paragraphs. Avoid repetition, such as explaining what medication reconciliation is multiple times. Provide more specific examples or evidence to strengthen the argument. The section discussing challenges faced by physicians could be expanded. Adding specific examples or statistics could provide a more compelling case.</p> <p>Method: Clearly define what constitutes a “completed medication reconciliation” to ensure consistent understanding. Similarly, elaborate on how physician satisfaction will be measured. While the interventions are well described, consider providing more details on the instructional video, such as its length, main topics covered, and how it was disseminated. Briefly describe what each PDSA cycle entailed and any adjustments made between cycles based on observed results. This can provide insight into the iterative nature of the process improvement. Consider including a brief explanation of how the effectiveness of each intervention will be assessed.</p> <p>Results: The results section now includes specific details about the interventions and their impact. Presenting pre- and post-intervention data provides a clear comparison, highlighting the improvement. Including information on physician satisfaction and any observed reductions in ADEs adds depth to the results..</p> <p>Discussion: kindly avoid repetition of sentences and ideas. The discussion contains several instances of repetition, especially in the paragraphs discussing training sessions and digital platforms. Summarize the interventions and their impact, acknowledging limitations, and providing future recommendations. Outline specific actions and strategies for maintaining and improving medication reconciliation procedures, making the recommendations more actionable. While the increase in medication reconciliation rate from 68% to 87.7% is mentioned, the discussion lacks detailed data or statistical analysis to support this improvement. Providing more specific figures, such as the number of training sessions conducted or the number of physicians who participated, would strengthen the argument. The discussion acknowledges the study's limitations but does so briefly. A more detailed exploration of the limitations, such as the short duration and small scale of the project, would provide a more balanced view. Additionally, discussing how these limitations might have affected the results and how future studies could address them would be beneficial. The recommendations for future actions are practical but could be more detailed. The discussion emphasizes the importance of engaging physicians through training and reminders. However, it could benefit from mentioning any feedback or input from the physicians themselves. Including quotes or survey results from the physicians would add a human element and provide evidence of their engagement and the intervention's impact.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the success of the quality improvement project at Alwajba Health Center, highlighting the significant increase in medication reconciliation rates due to strategic interventions. It underscores the importance of maintaining and improving these initiatives to ensure ongoing advancements in patient safety and care quality.</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:	Fehmi Mushtak Mukadam
Department, University & Country	GMC, Miraj, India