

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78748
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use of Simethicone in a Public Healthcare Organization in Riyadh Region
Type of the Article	Original 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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT Aim: Line 1, please add one or two sentences about the gap of the research just before the sentence stating the aim of the study. Methodology: Please incorporate some important points like sample size and sampling method.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION Paragraph 1 line 6, you have written a phrase "didn't", it is good to write in long form. And do the same in the whole sections of the manuscript. Paragraph 1 line 6, for the author Moolla et al, please indicate the number in bracket just next to et al., and do the same for other authors (written at the beginning of a sentence/s) throughout your manuscript. Paragraph 3, line 4-6, the text is written in Calibri font type, please write it in similar font type with the other section of the manuscript. Generally, the whole manuscript should have similar font type. Paragraph 4, line1, write the name of the place instead of our region.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY It would be good to write and describe clearly and separately the study area with the map, study population, study design, sample size and sampling technique, data collection method and data management and analysis. You should also describe the study period with the study design.</p> <p>RESULTS and DISCUSSION In general the results and discussion are not well described. I prefer to write the results and the discussion separately, in separate topic/title. The results are presented only in table. You have to describe at least the main results in text. When you describe the table in text, please don't start the paragraph with "table 1 or 2 or other shows...". For instance, the text that states about table 5 starts as "Table 5 shows the departments that prescribed simethicone". This text would be better if it is started as "More than 57% of the prescriptions were prescribed by emergency department". And describe about the remaining departments' prescription. In addition, I recommend you to show the association of the different factors (e.g. age) with the use of the drug...either via chi-square or other statistical tools. The result would be good if it is organized in two subtitles as follows; 1. Demographics of the patients, it should include table 1 the text that stats about table. 2. Use of simethicone, it should include table 2-5 the text that stats about table 2-5. In the discussion section, you should discuss each result using other studies and/or by yourself using books or other references that can support your justification.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The conclusion is too short. Please write the conclusion broadly based on your results. Line 2, how did give the recommendation? To give such kind of recommendation at least you have to indicate a gap that is not covered by your study in your conclusion section. So, please do that.</p> <p>REFERENCES Most of your references are websites. It would be better to use published references rather than websites/unpublished works. And when you use websites, please write the link/url just before the date and year of access.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The study focused on an important issue and the manuscript may have a good contribution. However, the manuscript has some serious issues which need revision. The quality of the manuscript will be improved if the author revise the manuscript based on the given comments.	

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mebrie Zemene Kinde
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, Ethiopia