

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126383
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Knowledge and Practice of Community Pharmacist towards Amlodipine in Karary Locality: A Descriptive Cross-Sectional Study
Type of the Article	

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>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the knowledge and practices of community pharmacists regarding Amlodipine in Karary locality. The study is well - structured, with clearly defined objectives, and methodology aligns well with the research goals. The presentation of data is clear, and the statistical analyses are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is goo but it can be still modified as "Knowledge and Practice of Community Pharmacists on Amlodipine Use in Karary Locality: A Cross-Sectional Study"</p> <p>This Will clarifie That the focus is on pharmacists knowledege and practices specifically related to Amlodipine use, which may improve readability.</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>Abstract of article is satisfactory. The abstract effectively summarizes the study. However, adding details on the statistical method used to assess associations (e.g., Fisher's Exact Test) would clarify the methodological approach for readers from the outset</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript is presented in scientific systematic order.</p> <p>Introduction (Page 2-3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The introduction is comprehensive and well-informed. Consider including recent trends or findings related to pharmacist-led hypertension management interventions to strengthen the study's relevance in current practice. • Specific Line: The last paragraph of the introduction could briefly address recent studies or reviews on this topic. <p>Methods - Sampling (Page 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The sampling section could be clarified by explaining the rationale for choosing a sample size of 163 out of 282 pharmacies (e.g., based on power analysis or expected response rate). This addition would support the robustness of the study's design. • Specific Line: Add this explanation following the statement about simple random sampling. <p>Methods - Questionnaire Reliability (Page 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: You mention a pretest and Cronbach's alpha but could clarify if any revisions were made based on the pretest. This would provide insight into the questionnaire development process. <p>Specific Line: After mentioning the Cronbach's alpha (0.76), briefly describe any adjustments made post-pretest.</p> <p>Data Collection Method (Page 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Including information about how the questionnaire was administered (e.g., in-person, online) could help clarify the data collection context. • Specific Line: This can be added after the mention of data collection using a structured questionnaire. <p>Results - Statistical Significance (Page 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Adding p-values for all relevant comparisons in tables would enhance the clarity of significant versus non-significant findings. • Specific Line: Ensure each relevant comparison in the tables includes a p-value. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>Results - Graphical Presentation (Page 6-7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Figures representing knowledge and practice scores might benefit from more distinct labels and legends for easier interpretation. • Specific Line: In the captions of Figures 1A and 1B, consider adding clarifying labels for readability. <p>Discussion - Comparative Analysis (Page 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The discussion effectively interprets findings, but comparing results with similar studies in other regions could add context. Consider discussing how knowledge and practice gaps align with or differ from findings elsewhere. <p>Specific Line: In the paragraph discussing knowledge gaps, include a sentence on comparative studies in similar settings</p> <p>Discussion - Limitations (Page 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Although the limitations are mentioned, expanding on the potential selection bias due to geographic limitation (Karary locality) would help address generalizability concerns. • Specific Line: Add a note on selection bias in the limitations section. <p>Discussion - Future Directions (Page 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Adding specific recommendations for future research, such as exploring training on drug interactions, could enhance the study's practical implications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Line: In the last paragraph of the discussion, include a statement on recommended areas for future studies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion (Page 10) • Comment: The conclusion is succinct. Briefly summarizing the policy or practice implications would strengthen the study's takeaways for stakeholders. • Specific Line: End the conclusion with a summary statement on how the findings could inform pharmacy practice or policy improvements. 	
<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>○</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Research Objective and Relevance: The study sets out with a clear aim—assessing the knowledge and practices of community pharmacists regarding Amlodipine, a widely used antihypertensive drug. This topic is highly relevant, given the critical role pharmacists play in medication management, especially in resource-limited settings. 2. Methodological Rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Study Design: The descriptive cross-sectional design is well-suited to capture a snapshot of pharmacists' knowledge and practices within the specified locality. <p>Sampling: The use of random sampling and a sample size calculation, along with an adequately large sample size (163 pharmacists), strengthens the study's validity and the generalizability of its findings within the Karary locality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data Collection Instrument: A validated, structured questionnaire ensures that the data collected accurately represents pharmacists' knowledge and practices, enhancing the reliability of findings. <p>2. Appropriate Use of Statistical Analyses: Statistical analyses, including descriptive statistics and Fisher's Exact</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Test, are correctly employed to assess associations between knowledge, practices, and demographic factors. Using these methods to identify significant patterns helps in drawing meaningful conclusions from the data.</p> <p>3. Ethical Considerations: The study adheres to ethical guidelines, with approval from an ethics committee and informed consent from participants, ensuring that it meets ethical standards for human research.</p> <p>In-depth Discussion and Interpretation of Results: The manuscript provides a thorough discussion of results, addressing the gaps in knowledge and practice among pharmacists and the factors that may influence these areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By comparing findings with similar studies, the authors contextualize their results, adding depth to the discussion. 2. Practical Implications and Future Directions: The manuscript offers valuable insights into areas where pharmacists' training could be improved, especially regarding drug interactions and patient counseling. This practical focus, coupled with suggestions for future research, enhances the study's applicability and long-term impact on pharmacy practice. 3. Limitations Acknowledged: By acknowledging limitations, such as geographic restriction to the Karary locality and potential biases in self-reported data, the authors transparently address potential constraints, which helps maintain scientific rigor. <p>Together, these elements make the manuscript scientifically robust and technically sound, providing credible insights and useful data for improving pharmacy practice in the region</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>References (Page 11)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: References are relevant and up-to-date. Review for formatting consistency, ensuring that punctuation and italics are used correctly throughout. • Specific Line: Conduct a full review of formatting across all references. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Grammar and Consistency (Throughout): Check for minor grammatical issues and consistency in terminology, such as "Amlodipine's indications" vs. "Amlodipine indications." • Tables and Figures (Throughout): Ensure all tables and figures are referenced within the text for better readability and flow. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Gautam Prasad Chaudhary
Department, University & Country	Pokhara University, Crimson College of Technology, Nepal