

Review of: "Could a Simple Barcode Enhance Patient Safety by Raising Awareness of Black Box Warnings? How Can We Bridge the Knowledge Gap in Medication Risks Among Health Professionals?"

Sameen Abbas¹

¹ Quaid-i-Azam University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper titled "Could a Simple Barcode Enhance Patient Safety by Raising Awareness of Black Box Warnings? How Can We Bridge the Knowledge Gap in Medication Risks Among Health Professionals?" The topic is important and relevant, and the manuscript is well-written. Several concerns, however, need to be addressed:

1. Abstract should be updated. No coherence is seen in the shared version. It should be started as "Black box warnings are the strongest drug safety warnings issued by regulatory authorities, highlighting the potential risks associated with specific medications. However, there is often limited understanding and awareness of these warnings among both healthcare providers and patients, which can lead to inadequate risk management and patient safety. So, we target to find solutions to prevent potential side effects and severe interactions by closing knowledge gaps and proposing strategies for improving awareness and reducing adverse events related to medications with black box warnings" and so on.
2. Update keywords; use MESH terms as keywords while omitting simple words like "gap."
3. Your sentences in the introduction are clear and convey their message effectively. However, there are some grammatical and stylistic changes required throughout for clarity and readability.
4. No citation for clinical practice example 1.
5. The cigarette parameter should be a part of the introduction, not a separate heading.
6. "We welcome the opportunity to discuss this initiative further and explore potential collaborations." To whom are you welcoming? Is this a review paper or a conference presentation in which such informal material is mentioned?
7. "**Finally**, we suggest the black box warning must have a barcode or logo on the outer pack of the drug (Figure 1)." It is not a concluding statement; in fact, it is a start to defend your idea.
8. Repeatedly, the same abbreviations are used.
9. No citations are there to support your work.
10. The conclusion is not predicting the real outcomes, with major ambiguities present.

Remember to carefully proofread and edit your manuscript to address major grammar issues throughout, as somewhere past tense is written, but in the next line, it changes to present tense. Having a professional editor for the desired purpose may also be helpful.

So, major modifications and corrections are required for the whole document. I look forward to reading the full paper to better understand the study's nuances and impact.