

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79445
Title of the Manuscript:	Prescription audit of outpatient attendees in Gynecology department in India
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 (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	<p>1. A. There are numerous “Grammatical” mistakes, so, corrections and language editing are obligatory (Major).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>2. A. Regarding the “Title”; the author should clear the innovative issues of this research to be differentiated from other publicized articles such as " An audit of prescription forms of patients from obstetrics and gynecology clinics in tertiary care hospitals: An exploratory study"; URL: https://www.ijms.in/article.asp?issn=0976-2884;year=2020;volume=11;issue=2;spage=85;epage=87;aulast=Singh (Minor).</p> <p>3. A. The “Objective” of the “Abstract” is inaccurate. Please, change to be "The study aim to determine the quality of outpatient department (OPD) prescription forms in an Indian tertiary care with highlighted the elements that should be writing in a prescription to improve the institution's overall quality of care" (Minor).</p> <p>3. B. The author put the “Methodology” of the “Abstract” as a definition starting with "The auditing process is a cyclical activity been agreed upon ". This is incorrect. Please, describe what is the methods that used in processing this research? Don't give a definition (Minor).</p> <p>3. C. The “Conclusion” of the “Abstract” is very bad. Don't start the “Conclusion” by " Prescribers must be ...". Your “Conclusion” is a reflection of your “Results”. So, you should start this the “Conclusion” for example; "We concluded that...."and you can give the recommendations at the end (Minor).</p> <p>4. A. The “Results” is bad-written. The “Results” should be written in numbers, ratios, and percentages, not in empty words. Please, reconstruct it again (Minor).</p> <p>5. A. I don't know How the author had written the "Discussion" with no numbers in the results? (Minor).</p> <p>6. A. The final “Conclusion” is not well-written. Please, reconstruct it again (Minor).</p> <p>7. A. There are different “Reference styles; Why? Unification for Reference style is needed. Please, correct it (Minor).</p> <p>7. B. There are some “References” that were indexed but the indexing of the remaining “References” was neglected. Please, review and add the defective indexing. (Minor).</p>	
Optional/General comments	-	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yasser Mohammed Hassanain Elsayed
Department, University & Country	Egyptian Ministry of Health, Egypt