

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130677
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Physico-chemical parameters of selected Clotrimazole pessaries from pharmaceutical importers and Accredited Drug Dispensing Outlets in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>(A) Overview/summary of the manuscript Congratulations on such a thorough study that assesses the quality of clotrimazole pessaries in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, focusing on products from pharmaceutical importers and Accredited Drug Dispensing Outlets (ADDOs). Conducted between 2021 and 2022, it analyzed 72 samples for active ingredient content and disintegration time. While all samples passed the disintegration test, 2.78% failed the assay for active pharmaceutical ingredient content, with failures linked to poor storage conditions at some ADDOs. The study highlights the need for stringent storage standards and regulatory oversight to maintain drug quality. Some points need to be addressed:</p> <p>(B) Title - The title is well chosen and reflects the contents and intended purpose of the paper.</p> <p>(C) Abstract - The abstract is properly structured as per IMRAD methodology and provides a clear picture of the paper. - LINE: 19: The authors are asked to provide details on the meaning of “mystery clients through the convenient method”. The sample collection was done over the counter, by pre-assigned personnel or via regular patients/customers through a prescription? If done by non-trained personnel, then how was the temperature and humidity recorded at the time of purchase (see LINE 288).</p> <p>(D) Keywords - Well chosen.</p> <p>(E) Introduction - Well written, it touches on all major points later discussed in the paper. - The number of citations is adequate (18) and so is their timespan.</p> <p>(F) Materials and Methods - Generally, this section is well written and well-structured with all major subchapters present and correctly identified by sublabels.</p> <p>(G) Results - The results section is well written and grouped in subsections, according to the data analyzed. - All units are in IS. - LINE 288: how was the temperature and humidity recorded since the samples were obtained “via mystery clients” (LINE 19). So, was this data recorded without the consent of the personnel on site? - Please provide details on the type and model of the thermometer and hygrometer used and whether these devices were for professional use and if they have been properly calibrated before measurements. Since the temperature recorded in some locations was as little as 1 degree Celsius above the manufacturer’s recommendations, this is important. Also, provide a model of the sample collection form.</p> <p>(H) Discussions - This section is properly redacted, with sufficient citations taken into consideration - The paper lacks a dedicated “limitations of the present study” section, that should be inserted just after the DISCUSSION section ends (LINE 356).</p> <p>(I) Conclusions - All conclusions presented in the paper are properly supported by the analyzed data. - The recommendations section (LINES 370-376) should be moved and integrated into the conclusions section.</p> <p>(J) References - The references provided (23 in total) are suitable for a proper citation list, both regarding the timespan (in 1980: only 1 paper, 1990: 2 papers, 2000: 7 papers, 2010: 10 papers and 2020: 3 papers) and number. Only 1 paper was from 1980.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Effectted revision</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revision made</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>- No excessive self-citation was detected.</p> <p>(K) Quality of English language</p> <p>- The level of the English language used in drafting this material is particularly good and needs no further proofing.</p> <p>(L) Quality of Tables and Images</p> <p>- The tables provided are clear and concise and use de IS format for units.</p> <p>FINAL RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>- This study though very well conducted and properly redacted, with an incredible attention to detail in organizing the chemical test and recording the results, fails to address the general purpose of a scientific paper: drafting the premise. The conclusions, although clear and properly supported by the experiments, land on an already known and proven fact, that failing to adhere to strictly to the manufacturer's recommendations for storage may lead to an increase decline in the degradation of the product. In this regard, taking into account the presence or absence of a fan in ADDO locations is pointless, since the temperature per se is the investigated parameter and not how, technically speaking, this temperature was reached and maintained. Coming back to the conclusions and the premises of this paper, these do not constitute for an original research. However, if the authors demonstrate that, even by respecting strictly the manufacturer`s recommendations for storage, but keeping the products at the far end of the temperature range, the products would disintegrate more rapidly than stated, then such a coclusion, that these products may not be suitable for tropical areas, would validate a study.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Effectted revision</p>
--	--	--

PART 2:

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