



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_46159
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacy student's perceptions and evaluation of a formative OSCE added into their curriculum in Northern Cyprus.
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	<p>Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The study is about 5th year level in 1 Pharmacy school in Northern Cyprus. So, the title is misleading. It is better to write full word rather than writing abbreviations. <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Abstract is not comprehensive – Number of participants and their demography were not stated. ✓ Sentences don't start with figures; ✓ The authors should add information about the statistical methods in the Methods section. It is better to rephrase in precise and concise manner ✓ Many expressions need to be rephrased for clarity. ✓ Regarding key words, they are too long and re write again. They should use precise and concise words for their article. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening paragraph is prescriptive stating what should be done. • There is no background information on the structure of Pharmacy education in this programme or in Northern Cyprus, no information on methods used to assess clinical competence in pharmacy and why OSCE is advocated in this programme. • Procedures for executing the OSCE should not be in the introduction. • The problem statement should be presented clearly in context with the study setting. • Explain the term "Turkish inhibited" in the last paragraph since not all readers understand this. <p>Methods and Setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no information on the setting of the study so it is better to include it. • There is no information on the study design and methods used • No information on the study participants, population, and sampling procedure • No description of the structure of research instrument (the questionnaire) • No information on the validation processes for this questionnaire • No information on how the responses were rated or rating rubric • No information on who collected the data • No statement of ethical approval and ethical considerations relating to the participants, the institutions, and the researcher (especially the issue of power differentials) • No comprehensive information on data analysis and statistics <p>It is necessary to specify whose made the evaluation instrument of the different stations, what were the parameters with which the cases of the stations were elaborated.</p> <p>Express where and how was do instrument was designed to evaluate the performance of students in different stations.</p> <p>It is only mentioned that there was a validation of experts, no was not do the reliability that could be done by the G theory.</p> <p>the authors should go over the whole text then it is full of orthographical and spelling mistakes (i.e. lines 84-91)</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data on participants' demographics • No data on response rate • No information on the validity and reliability of the dataset – Principal component analysis should provide information on the structural domains of the questionnaire while Cronbach's alpha coefficient should provide information on the internal consistency of the dataset. • The discussion lacks critical in-depth interpretation of the findings. The implications for theory and/or practice were not clear <p>The results are only those referring to the opinion of the students about the OSCE but the scores obtained by the students are not determined in the different areas evaluated.</p> <p>It is very necessary to establish if there are significant differences between the groups in relation to the scores obtained, since it could suggest us bad structuring of the stations.</p>	<p>Dear reviewers and academic editor, thanks much for your time and fruitful comments on the article "Pharmacy student's perceptions and evaluation of a formative OSCE added into their curriculum in Northern Cyprus."</p> <p>Your review and comments would further help and enhance the readability and delivering of article message.</p> <p>In the following few lines we would like to share our responses and describe the enhancement we made on the article following your comments and recommendations.</p> <p>Point 1: Regarding title. Response 1: Thanks, we also agree and title were corrected accordingly. Please see highlighted title page in revised version of the article</p> <p>Point 2: Regarding abstract Response 2: That's true, thanks for your recommendation and sentences were corrected accordingly and please see highlighted abstract section of revised version of the article.</p> <p>Point 3: Regarding key words. Response 3: Thanks for recommendation, we also agree and key words were corrected accordingly. Please see highlighted key word part in abstract section in the revised version of the article.</p> <p>Point 4: Regarding Introduction: Response 4: Thanks for your recommendation. The manuscripts introduction was corrected accordingly. Please see highlighted part on introduction section in revised version of the article and we included the last paragraph in discussion section.</p> <p>Point 4: Regarding Methods and Setting: Response 4: That's true, thanks very much. We corrected accordingly. Please see highlighted part in participant and design section of revised version of the article.</p> <p>Point 5: Regarding Results and Discussion Response 5: That's true, thanks very much. We also agree and corrected accordingly by incorporating sentences which explain the response rate, validation and reliability of data set in result.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>With the results it could not be determined that it is a good tool to evaluate an experimental clinical practice course of pharmacy adopted by a pharmacy school in northern Cyprus, as established in the objective</p> <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section contains many critical errors and inconsistencies 	<p>Section. Please see highlighted part in revised version of the article.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It is suggested to review the existing bibliography of the subject such as:</p> <p>Ruesseler M, Weinlich M, Byhahn C, et al. Increased authenticity in practical assessment using emergency case OSCE stations. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Prac. 2010;15(1):81-95. 19.</p> <p>Streiner DL, Norman GR. Health Measurement Scales: A practical guide to their development and use. En: Norman GR, Streiner DL, eds. 4.a ed. Oxford University Press; 2008. p. 452. 20. Van Der Vleuten CP. The assessment of professional competence: Developments, research and practical implications. Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Prac. 1996;1(1):41-67. 21.</p> <p>Mavis BE, Henry RC. Between a rock and a hard place: finding a place for the OSCE in medical education. Med Educ. 2002;36(5):408-9. 22. Hill DA, Guinea AI, McCarthy WH. Formative assessment: a student perspective. Med Educ. 1994;28(5):394-9.</p>	<p>Point 6: Regarding Reference</p> <p>Response 6: That's true, thanks very much. The references are corrected. Please see highlighted part of reference section in revised version of the article.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>The ethical aspects of the study are not mentioned, and it is necessary to describe</p>	<p>Response 7: yes we mentioned in methods and material section of the revised manuscript in ethical approval section. Please see highlighted part of ethical approval section in revised version of the article.</p> <p>Thanks a lot for your effort and contribution to our work.</p>