

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81023
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of the attitudes towards mentally ill people among a sample of primary health care physicians in Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Primary Study

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>This is a study with an important objective to improve knowledge regarding the attitudes and behavior of primary care physicians with mental illness. Despite offering significant contributions, especially for the country where the study is carried out, there are some important considerations that the reviewer is obliged to mention, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing of the article should be significantly improved. English is of a much lower quality than expected for publications in scientific journals; - Sometimes authors use more than one typeface in the same sentence. These errors are regrettable and should be avoided, there is no justification for them to appear at this stage in which the manuscript must have been analyzed by more than one of the authors; - In the introduction, which is too long, the authors present several studies to present some considerations on the subject. Despite the interest of the results of the aforementioned studies, the studies are from different realities different from the cultural reality of Saudi Arabia (South Africa, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Japan). It would be important to present studies of more similar cultural realities; - For this reviewer, the fact that there is an increase of citizens in Saudi Arabia resorting to primary health care services due to mental health problems is a pertinent justification for carrying out this study. However, on what facts are the authors based to present the hypothesis "We hypothesized that Arabic speaking physicians working in primary health care centers in Saudi Arabia have bad attitudes toward mentally ill people"? To suggest this hypothesis, the authors should present a justification, even if it was an observation of the investigators' clinical practice; - The methods used by the authors seem adequate and are well exposed. The biggest doubt resides in the sample itself, specifically, in the average age of the participants (31 years old) and in the length of professional experience (36% less than two years of professional practice). Although this results from acceptance for participation, it is a fact that cannot be ignored, the reduced professional experience can affect the results. It is considered that an inclusion criterion with a minimum period of professional experience could have been relevant. - The conclusion presented needs to be improved, as it seems insufficient given the results obtained. <p>Although considering that the study results may shed some light on the topic under study, particularly for the study population, the manuscript presents some insufficiencies that must be corrected, which lead the reviewer to consider an evaluation of Major revision.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "affecting people of all age groups" – suggestion: remove the word <u>groups</u> (redundancy); 2. "having current or past history of mental illness" – suggestion: remove the word <u>past</u> or <u>history</u> (redundancy); 3. "Conclusions: Primary health care physicians in Saudi Arabia have positive attitudes toward mentally ill patients, female physicians , having (Board, PhD or Fellowship), working for less than a year and having a history of involvement in the care of a mentally ill person were significantly associated with better attitudes." – This sentence must be enhanced; 4. Keywords: 3 to 5, MESH Terms; 5. "according to (age, gender, nationality, marital status, work status, number of work years, residency, and academic qualification)" – Remove the parentheses. 6. "study (those who have past history of mental illness, those who have been exposed to mentally ill people, and those who have not)" – Same as previous 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General 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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Although the authors consider that the complete completion of the questionnaires meant consent to participate in the study, it is considered that another type of consent should be obtained. However, it is not an explicit violation of any ethical issue.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	João Vítor da Silva Vieira
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute of Beja, Portugal