

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_74927
Title of the Manuscript:	EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION TO IMPROVE THE KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE, PRACTICES OF HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS AND STUDENTS REGARDING THE PHARMACOVIGILANCE IN TERTIARY CARE HOSPITALS
Type of the Article	Research article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors have to differentiate the aim and objectives of the study. 2. In the introduction, the definition for ADR is as per WHO and the reference is not cited. Similarly the reference for definition of PV is not cited. 3. In page 2, the authors have mentioned the cost of treatment due to ADR and number of death due to ADR. However, the authors have not mentioned whether this statistics refer to a particular country or worldwide. 4. What is DDA? 5. Authors have not mentioned about IRB approval approval for conducting the study. It is suggested to mention the reference number of the approval in the methodology. 6. Was the reliability of the questionnaire tested? If yes the Cronbach's alpha value has to mentioned. 7. Methodology is not well written. Those participants not willing and not interested to participate is the study are the same. The inclusion and exclusion criteria should be revised with justification. 8. The questionnaire has only 7 knowledge based questions and the authors have categoried knowledge as high if > 11 points. This is not clear. 9. There is difference is the number of participants before counselling and after counselling. The difference should be justified. Why there is a less number of participants after counselling? Did the authors did not take the response of all the participants involved in the study or did the participants not interested. In this case, the same size before and after counselling are different. 10. It is generally mentioned that the study was carried out in India. It is not clear where the study was performed exactly? It was carried out among students and Health Care Professionals in tertiary care hospital of India and cannot hence cannot generalize that their finding suggests that there is scope in improving PV activities in India. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>There is a major revision required. The manuscript is not well written.</p> <p>I am concerned about the structure and syntax of the manuscript. Can be paraphrased much better to communicate the same message in a succinct fashion to make reading and assimilation easier and express clarity of thought.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shalini Sivadasan
Department, University & Country	Kmch College Of Pharmacy, India