

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_121926
Title of the Manuscript:	Bytes and Drugs: Safeguarding Pharmaceutical Data
Type of the Article	Review

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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 article highlights the critical importance of data integrity (DI) in the pharmaceutical industry, emphasizing its role in ensuring drug safety, efficacy, and regulatory compliance. It provides a comprehensive review of regulatory guidelines, challenges, and best practices, offering valuable insights into mitigating DI risks. By addressing DI lapses, this work supports the scientific community's efforts to maintain public trust, enhance data reliability, and uphold ethical standards in drug development and manufacturing.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suitable</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>NO</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 demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous analysis of data integrity (DI) within the pharmaceutical industry, adhering closely to established regulatory guidelines and industry standards. The authors provide well-supported arguments, citing relevant studies and regulations that bolster their claims. The methodologies discussed for identifying and mitigating DI risks are clearly articulated and aligned with best practices, ensuring technical soundness. The manuscript's thorough review of DI issues and solutions contributes to its robustness, making it a valuable resource for both researchers and industry professionals.</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>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>NA</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:	Dipali Talele
Department, University & Country	Vishwakarma University, India