



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38452
Title of the Manuscript:	Curbing Polypharmacy Among Primary Health Care Workers: The Impact of An Educational Intervention
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. If polypharmacy is defined as the use of multiple drugs, how the use of "1"-13 or "1"-10 drugs (L.No.20) be considered as polypharmacy. This statement requires change. (Or am I misreading it?) 2. L.No. 79-83: It is my humble opinion that the objectives should have included the possible drug interactions in all cases where polypharmacy was practiced. Can this be addressed? 3. The reasons for polypharmacy in this study have not been elaborated, instead only those mentioned in other studies are listed.	1. The statement implies that the number of drugs prescribed per patient in the study area ranged from as low as one drug to as high as thirteen drugs (1-13); while in the control area, it was from as low as one drug to as high as ten drugs (1-10). However, the sentence has been re-arranged (changed as suggested) and high-lighted to express the information in better clarity. 2. With every due regard and respect, the scope of the study was not intended to cover or address drug interactions directly, but only mentioned it as a possible consequence or effect of polypharmacy. Therefore, the authors did not collect (any) data on drug interactions. The study had a two-fold objective of: (i) assessing the pattern of prescriptions issued in the PHC facilitiesbeingstudied,withparticularreference to the number of drugsprescribed per patient, and (ii) demonstrating the role of educational interventions in correcting or improvingthese patterns. 3. The study was essentially a retrospective audit and analysis of PRESCRIPTION RECORDS; and not a direct collection of data from the prescribers themselves, from whom reasons could have been elucidated. Therefore, reasons for polypharmacy within the context of this study could not be ascertained directly. Thus, we thought to mention findings (reasons) from other studies, whose scope covered this aspect. However, in view of the relevance of these observations made, we have decided to mention and include these two points (No. 2 and No. 3) in the manuscript, captioning and highlighting them as LIMITATIONS of the study, following the "discussion and conclusion" sections of the manuscript..
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Well executed study the report of which can be significantly enhanced, if the two latter point mentioned above (No.2 and No.3) are addressed.	