

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_125897  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>The knowledge of general population regarding Allergic Rhinitis: An observational study from Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | Reviewer's comment   | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <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>This manuscript addresses a critical gap in understanding allergic rhinitis among the general population, emphasizing the need for improved awareness and education. The findings indicate that a significant portion of respondents lacks correct knowledge about the condition, which could hinder effective management and treatment. I appreciate this study for its methodological approach and focus on demographic factors that influence knowledge, as it underscores the importance of tailored educational interventions. By identifying specific gaps in understanding, this research provides valuable insights that could inform future public health initiatives and improve patient outcomes in allergic rhinitis management.</p>  | <p>.</p>  |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>   | <p>The title is informative but could be more concise and engaging. Here's a suggested alternative:</p> <p>"Knowledge Gaps in Allergic Rhinitis Among the General Population: An Observational Study in Lahore, Pakistan"</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>The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could be improved for clarity and conciseness. Here are some suggestions for enhancement:</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Make the objective clearer. Instead of "to identify gaps," consider "to identify knowledge gaps."</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> Specify the time frame and method of sampling. For instance, mention if it was random sampling. You might also clarify that the participants had physician-diagnosed allergic rhinitis.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> It would be helpful to summarize the key findings in a more structured way, perhaps highlighting the significance of the knowledge gaps.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Strengthen the conclusion by reiterating the implications of the findings for public health.</p>  |   |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>   | <p><b>Content Suggestions:</b></p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <p>Briefly define terms like "KAP" (Knowledge, Attitude, Practice) for clarity, especially for readers unfamiliar with them. Consider including a brief overview of the significance of understanding allergic rhinitis in public health.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b></p> <p>Specify the sampling method (e.g., convenience sampling, random sampling) for clarity. Include details on how you validated the questionnaire beyond just mentioning expert validation—was there a pilot test, for example?</p> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <p>In the Results section, more context about what constitutes "appropriate" versus "inappropriate" knowledge could enhance understanding. Discuss the implications of findings in a more integrated manner rather than presenting them as isolated observations.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Expand on the implications of your findings regarding educational interventions. What</p> |   |

**Review Form 3**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p><b>specific strategies could be employed based on the gaps identified?</b><br/> <b>Provide more context on how your findings compare to similar studies globally to highlight the uniqueness of your findings in Lahore.</b><br/> <b>References:</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that all references are formatted consistently. Follow a specific citation style throughout.</b><br/> <b>Additional Considerations:</b><br/> <b>Clarity and Precision:</b> Review for clarity and conciseness; some sentences can be streamlined for better readability.<br/> <b>Proofreading:</b> Look for minor grammatical errors and typos, ensuring the manuscript is polished.<br/> <b>By addressing these suggestions, your manuscript can become more comprehensive and impactful for readers.</b></p>   |  |
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <p><b>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its well-defined methodology, comprehensive literature review, and the systematic assessment of knowledge regarding allergic rhinitis among a diverse sample population. The use of a structured questionnaire, validated through expert review and pilot testing, ensures that the data collected accurately reflects the participants' understanding of the condition. The statistical analysis performed with appropriate software adds rigor to the findings, revealing significant associations between demographic factors and knowledge levels. Furthermore, the manuscript highlights the critical gaps in public awareness, underscoring the need for targeted educational interventions, which is vital for improving patient outcomes in allergic rhinitis management.</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b><br/>         =</p>  | <p>Your reference list includes a mix of recent and older studies. Here are some observations and suggestions:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b><br/> <b>Recent Publications:</b> You have several recent studies (e.g., 2023 and 2024), which is essential for current relevance.<br/> <b>Diverse Perspectives:</b> The references cover various aspects of allergic rhinitis, including epidemiology, management, patient attitudes, and guidelines.<br/> <b>Areas for Improvement:</b><br/> <b>Older References:</b> Some references, like those from 2001 (Skoner) and 2007 (Schatz), may not be as relevant given the advancements in the field. Consider replacing these with more recent studies that update or refine the information presented.<br/> <b>Geographic Representation:</b> While you have studies from different regions, ensure there's sufficient representation from areas most relevant to your audience or focus.<br/> <b>Suggested Additional References:</b><br/> <b>Recent Guidelines:</b> Look for the latest clinical guidelines on allergic rhinitis, as they are periodically updated (e.g., ARIA guidelines).<br/> <b>Meta-Analyses or Reviews:</b> Consider adding a recent systematic review or meta-analysis to consolidate findings from multiple studies.<br/> <b>Emerging Research:</b> Include studies that explore therapies or insights into pathophysiology published in the last couple of years.<br/> <b>Suggested References:</b><br/>         A systematic review on the impact of allergic rhinitis on quality of life or healthcare costs.<br/>         Recent studies on the effectiveness of new therapies (e.g., biologics) for allergic rhinitis.<br/>         Overall, updating some older references and incorporating recent reviews or guidelines will strengthen your reference list.</p> |  |

**Review Form 3**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p> | <p>The article you've shared demonstrates a solid understanding of the topic and presents relevant findings, but there are several areas where the language and structure could be improved for clarity and scholarly communication. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>General Observations:<br/>Clarity and Conciseness: Some sentences are lengthy and can be broken down for easier understanding. Aim for shorter, more straightforward sentences.<br/>Consistency: Ensure consistent terminology throughout the article. For instance, use either "Allergic Rhinitis" or "allergic rhinitis" consistently.<br/>Grammar and Syntax: There are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that need to be corrected. Proofreading for grammar and syntax will improve readability.<br/>Specific Suggestions:<br/>Abstract:<br/>Introduction Section: Change "the present study assessed general population's knowledge about Allergic rhinitis" to "This study assessed the general population's knowledge of allergic rhinitis."<br/>Methods Section: Specify that the "structured questionnaire contained 12 items related to knowledge about allergic rhinitis."<br/>Results Section: Instead of "It revealed that only 33.3% of respondents had correct knowledge," consider "Only 33.3% of respondents demonstrated adequate knowledge about allergic rhinitis."<br/>Conclusion Section: Simplify to "This study highlights a significant gap in respondents' knowledge, emphasizing the need for targeted education and intervention."<br/>Introduction:<br/>First Sentence: Consider rephrasing to "Allergic rhinitis is a heterogeneous disorder characterized by symptoms such as sneezing, nasal congestion, nasal itching, and a runny nose."<br/>Citations: Ensure that all cited studies are correctly formatted according to your chosen citation style.<br/>Transitions: Improve transitions between ideas to enhance flow.<br/>Methodology:<br/>Study Design &amp; Setting: Clarify by rephrasing "The present study is a cross-sectional observational study" to "This cross-sectional observational study was conducted..."<br/>Data Collection Section: Use consistent verb tense. For example, "The data was collected" should be "Data were collected."<br/>Results:<br/>Clarity in Data Presentation: Ensure that tables are referenced in the text for clarity. For example, "As shown in Table 1, the demographic characteristics of the study subjects included..."<br/>Summary of Results: Include more interpretation of results rather than just stating them.<br/>Discussion:<br/>Clarification of Points: Ensure that each point made is well-supported by data from your study or other literature. For instance, instead of saying "the knowledge of respondents regarding allergic rhinitis in this study is inadequate," consider providing specific statistics to support this claim.<br/>Citations: Ensure that all statements, especially those comparing your findings to other studies, are properly cited.<br/>Conclusion:<br/>Summarization: Instead of stating, "This Study shows the levels of KAP regarding allergic rhinitis among the future health care provider," consider summarizing the findings more directly, such as "This study reveals significant gaps in knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding allergic rhinitis among future healthcare providers."<br/>Final Suggestions:<br/>Proofreading: A thorough proofread will help catch typographical and grammatical errors.<br/>Feedback: Consider seeking feedback from peers or mentors in your field to ensure the content and presentation meet scholarly standards.<br/>By addressing these points, the article will be better suited for scholarly communication, making it more impactful and easier for readers to understand.</p> <p>Recommendations:<br/>Include a more detailed explanation of the informed consent process in the manuscript.<br/>Consider discussing any limitations related to the ethical aspects of the study, particularly regarding participant understanding and recruitment.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

**Review Form 3**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>If applicable, address any measures taken to protect vulnerable populations. By addressing these points, the ethical framework of the study will be strengthened, contributing to the overall integrity of the research.</p>  |  |
| <p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p> | <p>Editorial Comments<br/>Clarity and Precision:</p> <p>The introduction succinctly defines allergic rhinitis, but consider clarifying how this condition affects overall health to emphasize its importance. Including more specific statistics on prevalence could strengthen the argument for the study's relevance.</p> <p>Methodological Details:</p> <p>While the abstract mentions a cross-sectional observational study, it would benefit from including information on the sampling method (e.g., random sampling, convenience sampling) to provide context on how representative the sample might be. Clarifying how the questionnaire was validated could enhance the credibility of the findings. Mention any pre-testing or pilot studies that informed its development.</p> <p>Results Presentation:</p> <p>The results section could be streamlined for clarity. For instance, stating "33.3% had correct knowledge" is straightforward, but clarifying that this indicates a significant knowledge gap could strengthen the impact. The mention of "70.4% had incorrect knowledge" could be misleading, as the percentages should total to 100%. It might be clearer to state that 66.7% of respondents exhibited inadequate knowledge.</p> <p>Demographic Insights:</p> <p>The observation regarding female respondents having better knowledge is noteworthy. Expanding on potential reasons for this finding, such as educational differences or access to health information, could add depth to the analysis.</p> <p>Statistical Significance:</p> <p>It's good to see the mention of statistical significance (p-values &lt;0.05). Consider briefly explaining what this implies in practical terms for the reader, especially in relation to the findings on education and knowledge.</p> <p>Conclusion and Implications:</p> <p>The conclusion effectively emphasizes the need for educational interventions. It might be beneficial to suggest specific strategies or target populations for these interventions, providing a more actionable takeaway.</p> <p>Keywords:</p> <p>The keywords are appropriate, but consider adding "Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP)" if relevant, as this is a common framework in health education research that might enhance discoverability.</p> |  |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <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>Nasrin Fazel</b>                                  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Sabzevar Medical University of Sabzevar, Iran</b> |