



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6964
Title of the Manuscript:	Over the counter sale of prescription only medication in Abu Dhabi, UAE: Law enforcement or health ethics?
Type of the Article	Community survey cross-sectional study

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Literature review has poor transitions between studies and those mentioned aren't explained. Many seem like a random smattering of whatever study was done relating to health as opposed to a concise timeline of research and news articles leading to the present study. If the studies are indeed pertinent to the manuscript then delineate the reasons so there is clear understanding how they impact and lead to the necessity of the current paper. Example: Lines 67-70; 73-74 - Not sure why these are in this manuscript. Was there Institutional Review Board/ Ethics Committee approval of the methodology for this study?	Nothing exists on the subject and the present review was to place the study within the context of what is available. Nonetheless, I have amended the literature to cover the concerns of the Reviewer. Fixed Exempted. The study was not invasive and unit record data were not reported.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor grammatical and technical errors persist throughout the manuscript. Examples include: Line 32 – “have been doing” to “have made”. Line 69 - Needs space between “world while”. Line 89 – “Convenient”. Line 92 – Don't need to state that results come later. Line 101 – As opposed to non-scientific analysis? Table 3 – First column misspelled “Questions asked”. Line 117-119 – Rephrase, this sentence is confusing as written. Line 150 - “Be selling” needs a space between words. Table 4: “Advised buyers” needs a space between words. Line 187 – Either you mean observing pharmacists or at each pharmacy. Clarify. Line 192-193 – Confusing please reword.	Fixed. With respect to Line 89, please note that the technical name for this type of sampling is “Convenience Sampling”. However I have changed it to convenient to meet the Reviewer's comment Fixed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 238 – Misspelled “involving”. More besides those listed. Fixed Line 42-45 – While I don’t disagree with this assertion, to make such a statement some citation is required. If no peer-reviewed data exist, a collection of newspaper articles would suffice. Nothing in the literature In multiple places the tone of the manuscript is much too informal for a peer-reviewed journal. It sounds more conversational in parts rather than scientific. This is more acceptable in the discussion, however overall tone should be improved before consideration of publication. Example: Line 166. – Reworded to improve the article The link between law enforcement and illicit sales could be stronger in many places. It seems that this topic wasn’t directly addressed through survey and instead the authors relied of the fact that there are laws passed making this practice illegal is a sound basis for putting it under their purview. And indeed it is, however additional survey questions following “whether they knew it was illegal” such as “Are you afraid of legal repercussions?” “Have you ever seen police enforcing the law?” “Has anyone you know been arrested or fined as a result of illegally purchasing prescription medication?” or the like would add credence to the authors observations of never seeing a police officer at a pharmacy during the data collection. – This was tested in the field but the findings are in another paper titled “Strategies to address over the counter sale of prescription medicines in Abu Dhabi”. This paper is currently being finalized. What is reported in the current article is enough in terms of establishing the extent of, and attributes of, the practice	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors must be commended on their work for this study. Ethics is indeed at the forefront of health care and law enforcement, and its absence provides an avenue for potential harm to patients and professionals alike. It is a very interesting topic that needs to be addressed. As well, this study endeavors to build the rationale for more serious intervention by providing quantifiable evidence of the prevalence of the issue. However, before it can be accepted revisions need to be made.	Thank you again. The comments were helpful in improving the article.