

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_118779
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Transformation for Risk Mitigation and Compliance in Pharma Manufacturing
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, utilizing digital technology in pharmaceutical manufacturing has the potential to enhance patient safety and broaden medicine accessibility. It aids in bolstering risk management and ensuring regulatory compliance, facilitating the global distribution of safe and efficacious pharmaceuticals. Moreover, digital tools can streamline drug research and production processes, driving down costs by boosting manufacturing efficiency and flexibility.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, abstract flow shows that AI tool was used.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes, they are recent but it appears that references have been included in the conclusion section, which may not align with standard academic conventions. Typically, references are not included in conclusions unless they directly support specific points or arguments made within that section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Authors should ensure that grammar and sentence completeness are thoroughly checked.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In reviewing the manuscript, it appears that while the authors have aptly highlighted the significance of digital transformation within pharmaceutical companies, there exists a notable gap in the elucidation of how this transformation is practically applied in each context outlined. The data provided lacks comprehensive explanations, thereby hindering the overall clarity and depth of the manuscript. Furthermore, there is a discernible repetition in the presentation of the importance of digital transformation across various points, suggesting a need for more varied and nuanced insights throughout the document. Additionally, the uniformity in sentence structure and flow diminishes the readability and engagement potential of the manuscript. To enhance the manuscript's coherence and impact, it is advisable to consider incorporating tables or figures to simplify complex information and improve overall clarity. Moreover, addressing inconsistencies in data alignment would contribute to a smoother reading experience for the audience. In order to elevate the quality of the manuscript, the authors are encouraged to conduct additional analyses, provide clarifications where necessary, and offer revisions aimed at presenting fresh and compelling insights to sustain reader interest. This may involve consolidating repetitive information and offering novel perspectives gleaned from the literature survey, thereby enriching the overall narrative of the article.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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