



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_26638
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating tobacco hazard prevention in southern Taiwan
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION.- In this part of the article the authors use names for the documents cited which do not correspond to the real name. As an example, The Tobacco Hazard Report by the WHO corresponds to the WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic. This is confusing. It is recommended to review documents of recent years instead of older ones. They mentioned the WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic published in 2008. Now there is a newer publication of 2015. Some statements do not have a bibliography, this is the case of line 20: Article 13 of the Tobacco Hazards Prevention Act from Taiwan. METHODOLOGY: It is suggested to include a map, where the reader could visualize the different places studied. What comprises urban areas, mountain and coastal regions? How many retailers were studied in each region? The authors do not mention the total number of university students who participated in the study (males and females? Which range of age??) How do they look? Older or younger than 18 years? It would've been useful to include younger students (15 or 16 years old) in order to know the attitudes of	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	retailers with this group. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$ RESULTS: Please correct P it is p lowercase. Please check all the tables and text where p appears. Please check Table 2 in order to clarify its content. What is the meaning of Scheffé test in this sample??? The percentages are obtained from the total number of retailers visited or the number of retailers in each region? DISCUSSION: It would be interesting for the readers who do not know Taiwan status in the control of tobacco to get information about laws and accomplishment of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), which should be mentioned both in the introduction and in the discussion. CONCLUSION: With the methodology of the study, it is not possible to demonstrate that smoke-free multimedia pamphlets and advertisements are affective in tobacco hazard prevention. Please change this statement. What about the enforcement of laws to control tobacco sales to young people in Taiwan?? Ethical issues: The authors do not mention if they used an informed consent for the students who participated in the study. This issue is very important.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In general the article is clear but it would improve the quality of the texts to have a revision made by an English native speaker. Example: Line 15- "prevention to prevent"	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is necessary to have more information about politics for tobacco control in Taiwan, otherwise the reader miss the importance of this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guadalupe Ponciano-Rodriguez
Department, University & Country	Public Health and Pharmacology Department, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico