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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | This manuscript dives into a crucial yet often overlooked area of medical practice the impact of a physician’s personality on how they prescribe medications. By shedding light on the connection between psychological traits and clinical decision-making, it paves the way for a more personalized and human-centered approach to healthcare. The insights gained could help shape targeted training and policy initiatives that encourage sensible drug use and minimize prescription inconsistencies. For the scientific community, this research enhances our grasp of the behavioral factors at play in medicine and opens the door for more exploration into how personality can inform medical education and healthcare delivery**.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title gets the main idea across, but it could use a little polish for better clarity and impact. “Drug Prescription Behavior” feels a bit unclear and might benefit from more precise wording. Here are some refined alternatives to consider:  "The Influence of Physicians’ Personality Traits on Prescribing Practices"  "Exploring the Role of Physician Personality in Clinical Prescribing Decisions"  These suggestions are designed to make the psychological framework and clinical relevance stand out more clearly. |  |
| 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. | The abstract introduces an intriguing idea, but to make it clearer, more coherent, and scientifically sound, I recommend the following enhancements:  1. Polish Language for Clarity and Flow  Terms like “citizenry is Unique,” “an equivalent stimulus,” and “Practice sessions” could be elevated to sound more academic and fluid. Simplifying complex phrases and ensuring that subjects and verbs align will boost readability.  2. Highlight the Main Objective  The key argument how physician personality affects prescribing habits seems a bit hidden. Presenting the main goal upfront will draw readers in more effectively.  > Suggested revision: > “This review investigates how the personality traits of physicians impact their drug prescribing behaviors, a topic that remains largely unexplored despite its significance for patient-centered care and therapeutic effectiveness.”  3. Eliminate Redundancy  Some phrases—like “customized marketing initiatives” and “optimal utilization of resources”—are repeated and could be streamlined without losing their meaning.  4. Enhance Scientific Context  It might be helpful to briefly mention the personality frameworks being discussed (like the Big Five traits) or indicate that this is a narrative/scoping review if relevant. This will help position this study within an academic framework. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript dives into a significant topic, but from a scientific writing perspective, there are a few areas that could use some polishing to boost its credibility and clarity:  Terminology and Phrasing: Terms like "4P’s" and "citizenry is Unique" need clearer definitions and more precise academic language. It's also important to be consistent with key terms like “physician’s personality”—sometimes it’s in quotes, and other times it isn’t.  Logical Structure and Flow: The argument tends to hop around between ideas—like physician selection, marketing strategies, and patient care—without a clear, progressive narrative. A more organized layout (for example, problem statement → knowledge gap → purpose → implications) would really enhance its scientific framing.  Support for Claims: Some claims (like “no research conducted thus far”) should be supported with citations or evidence. Otherwise, they risk sounding speculative or exaggerated.  Scientific Objectivity: Phrases such as “smart and customized marketing initiatives” and “healthy environment for physician-Pharma association” come off as promotional. A neutral tone is key to maintaining credibility.  Typographical and Grammatical Precision: There are some noticeable formatting issues like inconsistent hyphenation and spacing that can distract from the substance of your work and make it feel less rigorous.  That said, the idea of exploring the role of personality in prescribing patterns is quite promising. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | Yes, the references are sufficient and recent |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the English language quality of this article is suitable for scholarly communications |  |
| Optional/General comments | With those little adjustments I have made above, the manuscript could be ready for publication |  |
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