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	**Title:** • The study is about 5th year level in 1 Pharmacy school in Northern Cyprus. So, the title is misleading. **Abstract:** • Abstract is not comprehensive – Number of participants and their demography were not stated. • Sentences don't start with figures; • Many expressions need to be rephrased for clarity. **Introduction:** • 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. **Methods and Setting:** • There is no information on the setting of the study • 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 **Results and Discussion** • 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 **References:** • This section contains many critical errors and inconsistencies	
Minor REVISION comments	• Significant language control bordering on expression is required. • The manuscript also contains many typographical and formatting errors.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* • The manuscript contains no indication of ethical approval by a constituted authority neither did it address ethical issues related to the participants, the host institutions, or the researcher	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Christian Chinyere Ezeala*
Department, University & Country	*Mulungushi University, Zambia*