

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_116430
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Of Educational Intervention On Knowledge, Attitude & Practice About Pharmacovigilance In Nursing Students In A Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study aimed to assess the impact of educational intervention on nursing students' knowledge, attitude, and practice of pharmacovigilance at a tertiary care teaching hospital. The manuscript is important for the scientific reports. However, the study has a number of major methodological flaws that negatively impacts its publications progress. 2. The title of the article is not suitable. I suggest the title of the article to be renamed as, "Impact of educational intervention on knowledge, attitude and practice of pharmacovigilance among nursing students in a tertiary care hospital in India: a cross-sectional study" 3. The abstract of the article is not suitable. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate enough to sufficiently explain the research question. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct. 6. The references are recent but not sufficient enough. I suggest the authors to include sufficient references of developed and developing countries for the discussion section. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. English quality of the article is not suitable. Massive English editing is required. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suggest the authors to rename 'Aim' in the abstract to 'Background' and include a short statement 2. State the study design within 'method and material' section of the abstract. 3. In the abstract, statistical tools used to analyse the results and inferential statistics used employed should be stated. 4. In the results, provide a detail demographic characteristic of participants and make the age of the nursing students clear whether it is specified in Mean (Standard Deviation) or Median (Interquartile Range). 5. P-values should be indicated along with the statistically significant variables. 6. Statements indicating the aim and objectives should be included at the end of the introduction section. 7. State the country where the study was conducted. 8. Rename the study design sub-section as 'study design and setting' and sufficiently describe the study area. 9. Is the provided informed consent verbal or written? 10. Clearly indicate that your questionnaire was self-developed upon a review of literatures. 11. In the method section clearly explain the below-mentioned sub-sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source and study population • Sampling design and sample size determination • Data collection tool and approach • Outcome measures • Data quality control approaches • How was the questionnaire validated? Did you conduct an expert review panel? • How was data reliability assured during data collection process? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you handle open-ended questions during analysis? • The statements and/or questions used to assess the knowledge of the participants are very weak. • Specify the time the students fill the questionnaire post educational intervention? Is it immediate after it or sometime after the educational intervention? <p>12. Discussion need massive improvement. Compare your findings with results from developing and developed countries. Moreover, policy implication should be added.</p> <p>13. I suggest the authors to include a recommending statement within the 'Conclusion'.</p> <p>14. Clearly state the name of the institutional review board along with the reference number. Moreover, explain the ethical considerations that were followed during recruitment of participants.</p>	
--	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nuru Abdu
Department, University & Country	Eritrea