

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_123038
Title of the Manuscript:	Patient Perceptions of Pharmacist-Provided Medication Therapy Management (MTM) on Hypertension
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 (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>The manuscript's importance to the scientific community lies in its focus on pharmacist-led Medication Therapy Management (MTM) in hypertension, highlighting an underexplored area of patient care that directly impacts medication adherence and health outcomes. By evaluating patient perceptions, the study addresses a critical gap in understanding the effectiveness of MTM services from the patient's perspective, providing insights that could shape future clinical practices and policy recommendations. Based on the depth of the study, I would like to appreciate the manuscript for its relevance and practical implications, especially given the emphasis on real-world challenges like medication costs and lifestyle changes. These findings can help inform targeted strategies to improve hypertension management, making the manuscript a valuable contribution to both pharmacy practice and hypertension care.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Patient Perceptions of Pharmacist-Provided Medication Therapy Management (MTM) on Hypertension", is clear and descriptive, but it could be refined for greater impact and specificity. Here below is an example of suggestion for improvement: "Evaluating Patient Perceptions of Pharmacist-Led Medication Therapy Management in Hypertension Management" The rationale behind the suggestion includes the clarity it gives the manuscript, and the details under the clarity part include the emphasis on the evaluation and the context of hypertension management. Also, the suggested title gives specificity, as the term "hypertension management" clarifies the focus and target population in the study. Furthermore, terms like "Evaluating" and "Management" make the title more engaging and informative for readers and, thus, better capture the essence of the manuscript and align well with the objectives and findings of the study.</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 is well-structured, but could be enhanced for clarity and impact. Here is a detailed assessment and recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Methods: The methods section mentions the use of survey instruments and statistical tools, but lacks details on sample recruitment and size, which are crucial for context. Including specifics, such as how participants were selected (e.g. random or convenience sampling), would provide better insight into the study design Results: While the results summarize key findings, they lack precise statistical details that add credibility. Including exact p-values and effect sizes (e.g. Cramer's V values) would better highlight the significance of the results, making the outcomes more convincing and robust for readers. Objective: The stated objective is clear, but slightly repetitive and could be condensed for clarity. Rephrasing to focus solely on evaluating patient perceptions and their impact on adherence without redundant wording would make this section more concise. Conclusion: The conclusion effectively highlights positive patient perceptions, but could be tightened by emphasizing the key barriers, such as cost and lifestyle changes, without delving into excessive demographic specifics. Focusing on the broader implications for clinical practice would strengthen the overall message Keywords: The current keywords accurately reflect the study's themes, but adding terms like "cross-sectional study" or "hypertension management" could enhance discoverability and better represent the study design. <p>These enhancements would make the abstract more precise, informative, and aligned with academic standards, ultimately improving its overall quality for publication.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>In terms of overall assessment, the sub-sections and the way the tables and figures are structured in the manuscript looks appropriate, except for minor adjustments in terms of the naming of the headings and the position of the headings (as seen in Table 3, for example), which emphasises my earlier assertions about the usage of the lexis and grammatical choices of words by the author. Altogether, the manuscript has a good layout of sub-sections and appropriate structure.</p>	
<p>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.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The author has done a good job in engaging in fairly recent citations of references. However, the author can still work to get more recent references and equally supply more references to make it a more academically excellent research study, in order to earn more visibility and research coverage. The use of PubMed and ResearchGate are great suggestions for research libraries and repositories that scientifically relevant and in-depth research efforts can be sourced. Lastly, the reference listing does not tally with the way they are cited in the body of texts within the manuscript. For example, the first reference citation in the body of the manuscript does not tally with the first reference itemised in the reference section.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some wrong use of lexical structures, punctuations, and minor typographical errors as well. However, in terms of overall usage of English language as well as the quality of the language, the author has really tried, and will just have minor corrections to make.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There are instances of repetition of ideas and words especially in the Introduction section. The use of many words to amplify the same ideas and opinions do not necessarily count to longer manuscripts in terms of word count. The author needs to assess this for better presentation and knowledge passage. The introduction section also needs to be a bit further expanded to give room for more literature reviews on medication therapy management with real-time and real-world examples, rather than putting all the focus on the role of pharmacists alone.</p> <p>Also, under the Materials and Methodology section, the author needs to clarify and review the dates for which the study was conducted because there seems to be some form of discrepancies with the dates. (i.e. May 15, 2024 – August 29, 2024 would not translate into seven months, and the year should be checked to confirm to actual year that the study was carried out)</p> <p>Furthermore, the author needs to explain more about the certification or skills of the qualified interviewers that were mentioned in the Materials and Methodology section.</p> <p>The full meanings of all notable and recurring acronyms should be written at least once first before subsequent usage of the acronyms.</p> <p>Lastly, under the discussion section, the author needs to fine-tune the usage of the English Language in the construction of sentences to project the kind of questions which the participating subjects answered. Also, the style of juxtaposing this study with such comparable studies elsewhere in the world seems not to be syncing enough. The author can make use of better suited styles of correlating other studies in a bid to drive home the salient points being assessed in the discussion in focus.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Oluwafemi Ajoyemi Ala</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Ibadan, Nigeria</p>