

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ JPRI _129181</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF DRUG UTILIZATION IN CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE</b>
Type of the 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>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

### Review Form 3

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b>  1. <b>Title Clarity:</b> The title could be made more specific by including the geographical context  2. <b>Methodology Details:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The abstract mentions cerebrovascular accident (CVA) and seizures, which are unrelated to CAD. This discrepancy should be clarified or corrected.</li><li>○ Inclusion and exclusion criteria for patient selection could be briefly summarized.</li></ul> 3. <b>Results Presentation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Data could be better organized, perhaps summarizing key findings in bullet points or grouping similar results for clarity.</li><li>○ Percentages reported (e.g., male-to-female ratio, prescriptions with generic names) should consistently align with the total patient population for easier interpretation.</li><li>○ The total number of prescribed drugs (471 antiplatelets, 1423 oral administrations) seems unclear and needs further context.</li></ul> 4. <b>Terminology Consistency:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Avoid abbreviations like "IHD" and "CAG" without prior expansion.</li><li>○ Ensure consistent use of terms like "antiplatelet drugs" and "essential medicines list."</li></ul>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<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>Amarnath Shanmukhe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>BLDEA's Shri B M Patil Institute of Nursing Sciences, India</b>