

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 87444

Title: Study on Good Clinical Practices among Researchers in a Tertiary Healthcare Institute in India

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02446043

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC

Professional title: Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-09

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-15 09:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-18 15:17

Review time: 3 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article needs some revisions before it can be published. 1. "No noteworthy differences in the total knowledge scores were found on the basis of duration of research experience, certification of GCP, and current academic position. This is shown in Table 2." - However, the p-value of 0.008 for the relationship between academic position and practice appears significant. There is also no explanation for the superscript a) preceding the p-value. 2. Similarly, in Fig 3, there is no explanation for the superscript b) preceding the p-value. 3. All the significant findings and relationships noted in the text and abstract are not shown in the figures or tables. This is inappropriate since Figures and Tables are meant to show the most important parts of the results.