

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_124224
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices among Community Pharmacists in Lahore Regarding Prescription Patterns in Children: a cross sectional study.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

Compulsory 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This study could provide valuable insights into the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of community pharmacists regarding prescription patterns provided the findings are reported in sufficient detail.</li> <li>- The manuscript would benefit from a careful proofread to address grammatical errors and improve overall clarity and flow.</li> <li>- The methodology section requires further clarification, particularly regarding the specific instruments employed. A more detailed introduction of the constructs used is essential. Additionally, the study should clearly define the criteria used to determine sufficient and insufficient knowledge levels.</li> <li>- While the study outlines two objectives, the focus seems to be primarily on the correlation between variables. The assessment of KAP is not fully explored. For example, the analysis could provide more specific information regarding the nature of attitudes (positive or negative) and how they relate to the other components of KAP</li> <li>- Author should also provide stronger evidence and citations to support certain claims in the discussion section.</li> </ul>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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>Yes, addition needed. Author need to be clear with what is needed in each section. E.g. Objectives: KAP should come after you have spelled out Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Methods: brief information about the study design, participants, data collection methods, and statistical analyses. Author has included results in this section. Results: Author should report the most significant findings relevant to the research objectives. Only correlation is reported in this section.</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>While the author has two clear objectives, the methodology section requires further elaboration. Specifically, the survey instrument should be described in more detail to ensure the validity and reliability of the data collected. Additionally, the discussion section should comprehensively interpret the findings, addressing their implications and limitations in relation to the objectives.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Sufficient. However, kindly revise the in-text citation that does not follow the required style guide.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Suggest to consider having the text proofread to check for errors in grammar and structure.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Wong Pei Nee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Applied Technology, United Arab Emirates</b>