

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_125897
Title of the Manuscript:	The knowledge of general population regarding Allergic Rhinitis: An observational study from Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Medical illiteracy in general population is a known factor, which negatively influences both timely diagnosis and treatment of all diseases. This study does not significantly contribute to improving this matter as it shows several problems namely the fact that it intended to evaluate knowledge among the general population but the majority of participants have a medical background. This was not sufficiently analysed in order to come to definite conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is not suitable as the majority of the participants are medical students/professionals, which the authors end up mentioning in their discussion and is probably a major bias	
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.	Yes. Minor corrections made or mentioned in comments	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction extensively describes the clinical picture of allergic rhinitis but presents some errors that need to be corrected. however, it does not present any data relating to the topic of population knowledge on which it should focus, according to the title.	
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.	Besides the major bias previously mentioned, the sample size was quite reduced. More information regarding the questionnaire used is needed in order to evaluate certain affirmations. More information regarding medical knowledge in the general population should be introduced, as it is later mentioned in the discussion (but without previous presentation of facts). More detailed comparison between the general population and the medical students/professionals groups could provide additional valuable data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	International consensus statement on allergy and rhinology: Allergic rhinitis – 2023, Int Forum Allergy Rhinol. 2023;13:293–859, DOI: 10.1002/alr.23090	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar and sentence construction in general should be thoroughly revised before submission	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Joana Bruno Soares
Department, University & Country	Hospital Lusitadas Lisboa, Portugal