

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	Research 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.	As a reviewer, I find the manuscript "Bytes and Drugs: Safeguarding Pharmaceutical Data" to be a valuable contribution to the field of pharmaceutical science. The comprehensive review of data integrity challenges, coupled with an analysis of regulatory observations and real-world case studies, provides crucial insights into the importance of maintaining compliance with cGMP.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As per personal suggestion, the title of a manuscript can be changed if it helps better convey the core focus and importance of the study, making it more appealing or accessible to the target audience. Alternative titles: 1. Pharmaceutical Data Integrity: Regulatory Hurdles and Mitigation Strategies 2. Safeguarding Data Integrity in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing	
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.	I would recommend following changes in abstract part: 1. Clearly state the primary aim at the beginning to provide context right away. 2. Omit overly detailed descriptions that can be elaborated on within the main text of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsection and structure of manuscript is appropriate in its original form.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific correctness and technical soundness. The comprehensive review methodology, which includes analysing FDA guidance documents, warning letters, and Form 483 observations, ensures that the findings are based on robust and credible sources. The inclusion of case studies from notable pharmaceutical companies like Ranbaxy Laboratories and Intas Pharmaceuticals provides real-world context and validates the identified data integrity challenges and their consequences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are enough to convey the core idea of article. However more focus can be given on recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is written in clear and concise academic prose	
Optional/General comments	Kindly look for grammar, syntax, and punctuation errors in the manuscript.	

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:	Gaurav S. Patil
Department, University & Country	Kavayitri Bahinabai Chaudhari North Maharashtra University, India