

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_113267
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of the clinical pharmacist in the management of depression
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Partially. Yes Yes Yes Yes	Dear, thank you for your considerations.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>The aim of this study was to analyze and synthesize the available scientific evidence on pharmaceutical care in the treatment of depression. The article begins by introducing the prevalence of depression and the potential role of pharmaceutical care in its treatment. The methodology describes a search for relevant studies and outlines inclusion criteria. Results and discussion present positive outcomes from five selected studies, predominantly from the United States, Spain, and Japan. Limitations such as a small sample size and geographical bias are noted. The conclusion is brief and lacks comprehensive summarization, providing limited insights for future research and clinical practice. I have some suggestions to improve the article.</p> <p>1. The introduction fails to highlight any innovative or novel aspects of the research. It seems to reiterate well-known facts about the prevalence of mental disorders and depression. Authors should describe the novel aspects of study and explain which gaps study has filled.</p> <p>2. The search strategy appears to be simplistic, relying on only two databases and using a basic combination of keywords. This might result in an incomplete representation of the available literature. Authors should provide justification for this approach.</p> <p>3. The decision to use only English and Portuguese as search languages might introduce bias and overlook relevant studies published in other languages, limiting the scope and inclusivity of the review. This should be accepted as a limitation of the study.</p> <p>4. While disagreements between reviewers are acknowledged, the methodology lacks transparency regarding the criteria or process followed by the third reviewer to resolve disputes. Provide details for this procedure.</p> <p>5. The results and discussion section should be separated.</p> <p>6. The way results are presented in the discussion lacks consistency across studies. Some studies provide detailed information on the number of participants, main results, and conclusions, while others lack such comprehensive reporting. Please be consistent in describing the studies.</p> <p>7. Limitations of study such a small sample size, narrow time interval, and geographical bias should be mentioned in discussion.</p>	<p>1.The suggestions were addressed in the introduction, as highlighted in yellow in the text</p> <p>2. The choice of two main databases aims to reduce the risk of search bias, ensuring that the studies retrieved are of high quality and relevant to the topic in question. Furthermore, the selected databases can provide sufficient coverage of available studies on the topic.</p> <p>3. According to the reviewer's recommendations, the limitations of the study were included in the discussion.</p> <p>4. The third reviewer directly evaluated articles in conflict between the two reviewers, considering articles aligned with the review objectives, methodological quality, including study design and minimization of possible biases.</p> <p>5. According to the reviewer, the results were separated from the discussions, as highlighted in</p>

Review Form 1.7

	8. Provide suggestions for future studies in conclusion section.	yellow in the text. 6. Dear reviewer, in accordance with the suggestions, the results of the mini review were separated from the discussion. The number of participants, main results and conclusions are mentioned for all articles included in the review. In the discussion of the mini review, the main findings and implications of the clinical pharmacist in the management of depression are addressed, as well as limitations of the study. 7. According to the reviewer's recommendations, the limitations of the study were included in the discussion. 8. According to the reviewer's suggestions, future perspectives are mentioned in the conclusion.
--	--	--

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)	