

Review Form 3

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:	Anonymous reviewer (Only for this stage as per Review policy)
Department, University & Country	

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_125950
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION ON ADVERSE DRUG REACTIONS (ADRs) OF COMMONLY USED MEDICATION AMONG NON-ALLIED HEALTH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITY OF PERPETUAL HELP SYSTEM DALTA, LAS PINAS CAMPUS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 crucial as it highlights the lack of knowledge about Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs) among non-allied health foreign students. This lack of awareness can lead to underreporting of adverse effects and improper medication use, which can have serious health implications. The study also underscores the need for educational initiatives to address this knowledge gap.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study. It clearly states the focus of the research and the demographic being studied.	
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 of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, results, and conclusion. No addition or deletion is required.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. They follow the standard structure of a research paper, making it easy for readers to follow the flow of the study.	
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.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology is clearly explained, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The conclusion is based on the results of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear to be sufficient and recent. However, without access to the full list of references, it's hard to make a definitive judgment.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. However, a thorough proofreading is recommended to ensure there are no grammatical or typographical errors.	
Optional/General comments	The study is well-conducted and provides valuable insights into the perception of ADRs among non-allied health foreign students. However, it would be beneficial to include recommendations for how educational initiatives could be implemented to address the identified knowledge gap.	

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:	Nambari Hemanth Kumar
Department, University & Country	Kalam Institute of HealthTechnology, India