



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_36666
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge Level and Perceptions of Pharmacists and Prescribers Regarding Boxed Warnings
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript article is well structured and written. The authors have written the manuscript meticulously and also adequately written the following core contents: Introduction-rationale, objectives-well defined, material and methods – detailed procedure with sample size justification and statistical analysis, results- adequately depicted in tables and figures. Adequate discussion with limitations Overall - well written research article However following are some comments for revision that maybe considered to strengthen the manuscript Subgroup analysis based on the different prescribers especially between physician (117)and physician assistant (34) (Note -nursing can be omitted as sample is very negligible) Elaborate more in discussion part on various interventions to improve such issues	1) Thank you for the suggestion. I did run this analysis, but they were not statistically significant (and as you point out we have some small sample sizes with NP and PA). 2) Thank you for your suggestion. I have elaborated a bit on this and added the following to the manuscript: “Consideration should be given to prominence and consistency of black box warning placement on literature provided with all drugs prescribed to patients with additional information provided to prescribers that describe the evidence base which led to the boxed warning in the first place. If prescribers and patients are able to consistently find and review these warnings then prescribers may consider alternative medications in some instances. At the very least providing the evidence base will allow prescribers to consider appropriate prescribing in context of the individual patient.”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		