

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_123034</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of community pharmacist's in managing Chronic diseases.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
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 explores the role of community pharmacists in managing chronic diseases, which are a growing global health concern. The study's findings provide valuable insights into the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of pharmacists, which can inform future interventions to improve chronic disease management in community settings. I appreciate this manuscript because it highlights the critical, yet often underappreciated, role of pharmacists in chronic care, potentially leading to improved patient outcomes. However, a larger and more diverse sample size could enhance the generalizability of the results.	
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.	<p>The abstract is fairly comprehensive but could be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are a few suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Objective:</b> The objective section could be clearer. Instead of repeating "the aim of this research" and "the aim of the current study," you could combine these into a single, more concise statement.</li> <li><b>Methods:</b> The methods section should briefly mention the study design (cross-sectional) earlier and include information about the sampling method (e.g., convenience sampling, random sampling) and the size of the sample that was targeted initially (110 participants) versus the final sample size (93 participants). This would provide better context for the results.</li> <li><b>Results:</b> The results section mentions the demographics but could be more concise. The key findings related to knowledge, attitude, and practice should be highlighted more clearly, rather than focusing on the gender and marital status of participants. This section should also mention if there were any statistically significant findings, as the p-value was discussed in the methods.</li> <li><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion is somewhat vague. It should specifically address the implications of the findings, such as how the positive knowledge, attitude, and practice among community pharmacists can impact chronic disease management.</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. The study uses a well-defined cross-sectional design, which is appropriate for assessing the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of community pharmacists. The data were analyzed using established statistical methods, including descriptive and inferential statistics, ensuring that the results are rigorously evaluated. Additionally, the study adheres to ethical research practices by obtaining informed consent from participants and applying appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria. These factors collectively contribute to the manuscript's scientific validity and reliability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	

**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>Yes, its suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Here are some optional/general comments for the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Clarity and Flow:</b> The manuscript is generally well-structured, but some sections could benefit from more concise language to improve readability. Consider revising lengthy sentences and avoiding repetition to enhance the overall flow.</li> <li>2. <b>Sample Size and Generalizability:</b> While the sample size of 93 pharmacists provides valuable insights, discussing the limitations regarding the generalizability of the findings to a broader population would strengthen the manuscript. A larger, more diverse sample might yield more comprehensive results.</li> <li>3. <b>Discussion Depth:</b> The discussion section could be expanded to include comparisons with similar studies conducted in other regions or countries. This would provide a broader context for the findings and highlight the relevance of the study on a global scale.</li> <li>4. <b>Tables and Figures:</b> The inclusion of more detailed tables or figures summarizing key findings, especially regarding knowledge, attitude, and practice differences, would enhance the manuscript's impact and make the data more accessible to readers.</li> <li>5. <b>References:</b> Ensure that all references are up-to-date and relevant to the current study. Including more recent studies in the introduction and discussion sections could further support the study's findings and situate it within the current literature.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Bondarieva Iryna</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>National University of Pharmacy, Ukraine</b></p>