

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82276
Title of the Manuscript:	Academic Resilience of Healthcare Professional Students in Pakistan: Need of the Hour
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Underwhelming <b>Introduction part</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One sentence about the aim of the article;</li><li>• No justification of the topic;</li><li>• Shallow theory/research with small number of citations;</li><li>• Nothing regarding the methods;</li><li>• Missing even a hint of Contribution of the article;</li><li>• Insufficient Grammar.</li></ul> Unacceptable <b>Conclusion</b> (5 lines of copy-pasted text is not a conclusion).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Nearly acceptable <b>Discussion</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Missing Contribution which is absent throughout the whole article;</li><li>• Rest is appropriate with slight discrepancies;</li><li>• Abstract says differences between gender, discussion says no differences, then again conclusion mentions differences;</li><li>• Insufficient Grammar.</li></ul> Acceptable <b>Abstract</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Could be clearer;</li><li>• Most of it is copy-pasted from body of the article;</li><li>• Insufficient grammar already.</li></ul>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Appropriate <b>Methodology part</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Very decent data set;</li><li>• Interesting methods although no explanation to what they are and why they were chosen;</li><li>• Debatable initial interpretation of the results</li><li>• Insufficient Grammar.</li></ul>	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martina Blašková
Department, University & Country	Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic