

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77459
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Awareness of the Need to Call the Emergency Medical Services Following the Onset of Acute Myocardial Infarction and Associated Factors in Jazan region, Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

[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	<div><div></div><div><div>1. Background has not been written properly. It requires a comparative study in tabular form.</div><div>2. Table name and table number has been written but not in same format.</div><div>3. Figures having no numbers.</div><div>4. Conclusion is not showing a glimpse of overall research, It should be written appropriately.</div><div>5. Some more references should be included.</div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div><div>Dear Editor,</div><div>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</div><div>Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript. We have reviewed the reviewers' comments and have thoroughly revised the manuscript. We found the comments helpful and believe my revised manuscript represents a significant improvement over the initial submission. In response to the suggestions, I made the following changes to address your valuable comments.</div></div></div> <div><div></div><div><div><u>Response reviewer</u></div><div>Dear reviewer,</div><div>Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. I have reviewed your comments and have thoroughly revised the manuscript. I found the comments helpful and believe my revised manuscript represents a significant improvement over the initial submission. In response to the comments, I made the following changes to address your valuable comments.</div></div></div> <div><div></div><div><div>Article Comments</div><div>" 1. Background has not been written properly. It requires a comparative study in tabular form.</div><div>2. Table name and table number has been written but not in same format.</div></div></div>

Review Form 1.6

		<p>3. <i>Figures having no numbers.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Conclusion is not showing a glimpse of overall research, It should be written appropriately.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Some more references should be included . "</i></p> <p>1. comparative study was added in the article as requested.</p> <p>2. We adjusted the formatting of table name and table number to be in same format as requested.</p> <p>3. Numbers was added to figures that having no numbers as requested.</p> <p>4. We did some modifications and added many paragraphs to make the conclusion show glimpse of overall research as requested.</p> <p>5. We added more references to the article as requested.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Faisal Ali M. Othathi</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Overall paper should be improved.	

Review Form 1.6

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>	