

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81812
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Attitude Toward Professionalism Among General Physicians of Primary Health Care Centers at Abha and Khamis Mushayt, Saudi Arabia
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. Need to review the limitations regarding attitude based on references, this is very important. Seeing the independent variables in this is attitude and the dependnet variables is professionalism. The term "attitude" as an independent variable in this study is not appropriate. it is better if you want to measure the effect of attitude on professionalism, then the correct operational definition is for example: the attitude of the doctor at the beginning of receiving the patient's arrival (do you agree if you give greetings and introductions first, do you agree if you communicate well); attitude when the doctor is about to take action (do you agree if given an explanation, do you agree if there is agreement on action), and so on which provides the stages of the doctor's attitude from the beginning of providing services to the end of providing services. If the condition has already taken data, then with the current condition of the research report, the correct variable is the doctor's perception of the factors that affect professionalism.</p> <p>2. The division of professionalism category :> 80% is considered "high", 60-79% is considered "medium". <60% is considered to have poor professionalism, this kind of distribution is not recommended statistically, because the range of values is unfair. use the division of categories with the calculation: high = mean plus 1 standard deviation, low = mean minus 1 standard deviation, medium = between low score limits to high scores. For example, mean = 7, standard deviation = 2.5, then the high limit is > = 9.5, low < 4.5, moderate 4.5 to 9.4</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	give an explanation of how to take samples: total sampling, purposive, or proportional sampling	
Optional/General comments	Correct the background, title, and variable names, because the research has been done, I suggest using the existing data but adjusting the variable names: the perception of factors that affect professionalism.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bambang Sutomo
Department, University & Country	Poltekkes Kemenkes Semarang, Indonesia