

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84760
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of education level on the rate of compliance with hygiene rules during the Covid-19 Pandemic in the TRNC
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors used an acronym but they did no clear what does it mean (TRNC). They did no specify what criteria they used for selecting the sample. There is a selection bias because they included only people with access to media. If this study was made in a low-income country, it is logic to think that most of the population does not have the possibility to use this media. The previous point maybe can explain the high percentage of people with university level. Sometimes it is not possible to understand the text because English is poor. There are some orthographic mistakes, that are no usual in an academic paper. I did not find the need to included graphs 4 and 5, and table 8, because these are data from other studies and this paper is not supposed a review article. Graph 3 is not concordant with the text. Did the authors made a validation of the scales used?, What was the interrater coincidence? Was it a self-report? How can this kind of test be affected for the fact to be self-report?	1. The article has been rearranged. 2. Abbreviations explained. 3. English language and grammar has been corrected. 4. Unnecessary tables and figures have been removed. 5. The scales used in the article were verified. 6. Spelling errors have been corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	