



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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABSTRACT: interviews are data collection tools while cross-sectional is a research design. You have presented as if they are similar and works. Reorganize. Does 13 stations mean school, university or colleges etc? You need to tell your reader where you conducted the study e.g. location/area. Check the findings and rework on the abstract to reflect your findings. Just have short and clear abstract which address Objective/purpose, methodology, results/findings • INTRODUCTION: The author has provided contextual analysis of the topic but needs to check clarity e.g. line 77-80, 97-99 • Avoid long sentence, which may change its intended meaning. • The author should show the sample size used at the METHODOLOGY and how the respondents were selected. • RESULTS section need more work. The author needs to present what is interesting as guided by the findings. What the author writes 80% of the students saw... what does this mean. Use proper research language. ALSO such sentence does not make sense.... While a close percentage, what does this mean? • DISCUSSION needs more work also. Discuss key areas and demonstrate how they agree or disagree with other researcher's work. • Check line 154-158, this area is not clear. • CONCLUSION should be guided by the objective(s) of the study. Check your first lines/sentence and should be linked to the topic under study. • Check this is conclusion you have provided: (It is therefore extremely important to invest in the Turkish students' positive perception...). You have not presented anything on advancement of pharmacy as a subject.. I case your study focused on assessment methods or I am not getting it. • REFERENCES are inconsistent as some have year of publication while others do not have. Also referencing styles need formatting 	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:
<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abraham Kipkemoi Kisang
Department, University & Country	Kenya