

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82315
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Understanding of Topic by Final Year BAMS Students, Using Different Teaching Modalities
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Overall, this paper is clearly written and understandable. Each part is organized well.	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical errors as in: 1. "traditional teaching is still a better option to online teaching" should be "traditional teaching is still a better option compared to online teaching"; 2. "The COVID-19, not only lead us to change our lifestyles,..." should be "The COVID-19, not only leads us to change our lifestyles,..."; 3. "... as a result of current teaching methodology changes as a result of the cancellation of traditional classroom instruction" should be "... as a result of current teaching methodology that changes as a result of the cancellation of traditional classroom instruction"; 4. "issues wit it" should be "issues related to it"; 5. "But the myths, doubts, and false conceptions about the ways online teaching is conducted, creates a need to research the effectiveness of the online teaching, ..." should be "But the myths, doubts, and false conceptions about the ways online teaching is conducted, create a need to research the effectiveness of the online teaching,..."; 6. "aims at comparing degree" should be "aims to compare degree".	
Optional/General comments	Selection of respondent might be clearly explained, including the reason of why there should be the exclusion criteria of research subject.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Purwitasari
Department, University & Country	University of Freiburg, Indonesia