

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>
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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides insights into the knowledge and practices of community pharmacists regarding Amlodipine, a commonly prescribed antihypertensive medication. Understanding pharmacists' competency in managing Amlodipine is crucial, as they play a pivotal role in patient education and adherence to treatment. The study highlights potential gaps that could impact the quality of care, especially in community settings where pharmacists often serve as the first point of contact. I appreciate this manuscript for addressing these gaps and presenting data that could guide targeted educational programs, ultimately contributing to better healthcare outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract provides a general overview of the study, but it would benefit from more specific details. To enhance its comprehensiveness, I suggest adding quantitative data that highlights key findings, such as the percentage of pharmacists with adequate knowledge or common gaps identified in their practice. Additionally, a brief mention of the study's implications—such as the potential need for targeted training programs—would strengthen the abstract by contextualizing the importance of the results. Overall, these additions would make the abstract more informative and engaging for readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and logically organized, covering essential sections such as Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion. However, adding a distinct "Limitations" subsection within the Discussion would enhance transparency by addressing any potential constraints of the study, such as sampling or generalizability issues. Additionally, a brief "Implications for Practice" section at the end of the Discussion could help emphasize how the findings might be applied in real-world settings, making the study's practical value clearer for readers.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it uses an appropriate cross-sectional study design to assess community pharmacists' knowledge and practices regarding Amlodipine, aligning well with the study's objectives. The methodology is clear, with well-defined sampling and data collection methods that contribute to the reliability of the findings. Statistical analysis appears to be correctly applied, enhancing the study's validity by allowing for objective insights into knowledge gaps and practices among pharmacists. Overall, these elements contribute to a solid foundation, making the study's conclusions credible and applicable to similar community healthcare settings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient, but a few recent studies would enhance its relevance and contextual grounding. Including articles published within the last three years on topics such as pharmacists' roles in managing antihypertensive therapy, medication adherence, and community pharmacy-based interventions could strengthen the literature review. Such references would also support the manuscript's focus on the importance of pharmacists' knowledge and practices for patient outcomes, providing a more current perspective on the field.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear explanations of key points and technical terms. However, there are some areas where sentence structure and word choice could be refined to improve readability and flow. Revising complex sentences and ensuring consistent use of terminology would enhance the manuscript's clarity and make it more engaging for an academic audience. Minor proofreading for grammatical accuracy would also strengthen the overall presentation.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Umesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	IMS Ghaziabad University, India