



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 (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	Line 6: <i>I think it is important to mention the title of this section: Abstract Methods</i> Line 14-15: including 715 pharmacists and 152 prescribers. <i>Are the respondents representative of dispensers and prescribers population?</i> Line 65-66: ...a sample of 540 participants was required. <i>I think that the sample size should be considered separately in two categories of providers: pharmacists and prescribers.</i> Line 66-67: ...Pharmacist participants were recruited by email, via a list maintained by the NC Board of Pharmacy, and prescriber participants were recruited through a postcard delivered by the US postal services. <i>Do you think that these two categories of recruitment are similar or equivalent? How do you explain the difference between pharmacists (715) and prescribers (152) relatively to respective populations (9,873 for pharmacists and 26,153 for prescribers).</i>	Line 6: Inserted "Abstract" There aren't really population estimates for dispensers and providers for NC (in regards to age, sex, race, education, etc.). Therefore determining if our sample is statistically representative is beyond the scope of the study to accomplish. You are correct, we did calculate the sample size needed based on differences between two groups in regards to our primary analysis. The total sample size would be 540 (ideally 270 in each group). Because we were conducting an independent samples t-test we assumed an alpha of .05, at 80% power and detecting at least a 10% difference between those two groups of interest. You make an excellent point. These two recruitment methods are not equivalent and the hassle associated with typing in a weblink from a post card likely served to stifle responses among prescribers. I have attempted to address this by adding the following to the limitations:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 82: The remaining entities were then available for inclusion in the survey. How much? Line 87: ...pretesting was not performed. Why? Results <i>I suggest you, to present the results according to the template below. That will improve the quality of the manuscript.</i> Table1: change "Demographics" into "Demographic characteristics" <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Pharmacists</th> <th>Prescribers</th> <th>Overall</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gender [No. (%)]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Pharmacists	Prescribers	Overall	Gender [No. (%)]				Women				Men				"The inclusion of a web link in the email solicitation to pharmacists likely contributed to the stark contrast in response rates (715 pharmacists vs. 152 prescribers). The extra step required for prescribers to respond consisted of typing in a web link from the post cards perhaps inhibiting response rates in this group." This was referring specifically to the drugs used on the "knowledge quiz" in Figure 1. We mention in the manuscript that we did ask colleagues to review the survey for face validity – Physician Assistant and Pharmacist faculty members reviewed and made suggestions to the survey. Actual pretesting would be fairly cumbersome given the difficulty accessing the prescriber population in particular. Thank you. I have made the suggested edits to table 1.
	Pharmacists	Prescribers	Overall															
Gender [No. (%)]																		
Women																		
Men																		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Race [No. (%) American Indian or Alaskan Native Asian Black or African American Hispanic or Latino Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander White (Caucasian) Pharmacist Practice Site [No. (%) Hospital Community-Independent Community- Chain Clinic/Ambulatory Care Industry Long Term Care Academia Did Not Report				
Table 2: Define N/A at bottom of the table 2 I suggest you to add "perception" to the title of the table. So the title of table 2 will be: "Behavioural and Perception Questions Mean Scores" Table 3: I don't know how you calculated the percent of knowledge results and the overall Mean percent score Discussion Line 187-188: The two drugs in our survey that were most frequently identified as having a boxed warning were warfarin and fluoxetine (87% and 79%, respectively; Table 3): these percentage are not mentioned in Table 3, how did you found it?					Thank you. I have made the suggested edits to table 2. This was simply the percent correct out of the questions asked. So a 55% is out of 100% of the possible points. There were 8 possible points; Thank you for catching this! This was an error in the manuscript. I have updated the discussion as follows: "The two drugs in our survey that were most frequently correctly identified by prescribers as having a boxed warning were warfarin and fluoxetine (78% and 74%, respectively; Table 3)."



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 75: change ...exclude a unique identifier... into ...exclude an unique identifier was made ... Line 170-171: ...prescribers scored on average 55% vs 56% in the Table 3. I think you must change 55% into 56% (see Table 3) Figure 1: I think that the denomination of Warfarin is not complete Line 205: change [10 into [10] Reference 11: change Hawai'i into Hawaii Reference 15: change "Responding to an FDA warning--geographic variation..." into "Responding to a FDA warning-geographic variation..."	Corrected. Corrected. Corrected. Corrected. Corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Very helpful comments!! Thank you very much for the review!!