



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_67761
Title of the Manuscript:	COUNSELING PRACTICES OF PHARMACISTS AT MEDICAL STORES/PHARMACIES IN KARACHI PAKISTAN
Type of the 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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The objective of the study was to evaluate the counselling practice. Cross sectional study method was implemented in this study. But the evaluation criteria were not stated in order to against which the present can be compared and contrasted objectively. Or otherwise there should be checklists and structured questionnaire. Also the sample collection period was not stated clearly.</p> <p>Is 365 representative sample? What method of calculation used?</p> <p>Discussion is missing. The finding in the present study should be compared and contrasted with the past study or literature.</p> <p>Discussion should explicitly discuss the counselling practice in terms of key criteria like on information on drug-drug interactions, frequency of dosing/intake, times of the dosing (morning, noon, afternoon, night), storage of medications and side - effects. How many of the study patients received counselling on which of these parameters?</p> <p>Also a comprehensive language revision is required.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>Yes, the confidentiality of the information by the patient for this study has not been clearly stated. Even though the authors say the patients were assured of the confidentiality, how could that assurance can be ensured is not clear. Since the patients may disclose the weakness of the dispensary system, this may affect the prospective service they may receive.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Temesgen Sidamo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</b>