



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_21826
Title of the Manuscript:	Tendency of Self-Medication among Various Malaysian Ethnicities
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Thanks to the author for the revised paper and the effort towards it. In general, where amendments have been done, the author did not answer what have been asked of them. Explanations were sometimes given, but not reported in the revised paper and <u>without clear references</u>, making them only blank assumptions. In addition, some explanations did not address the reviewer's comments at all, or did not impact the paper content as they were expected to. Serious major revisions have to be considered. After that, author is kindly advised to read the content of the paper as if he was a simple reader who knows nothing about the context of the study or the Malay population or the methodology etc. Thus, the author would clearly see what precisions are needed, and how to structure the precious informations given in the paper for the reader to be able to read and understand each line with fluidity.</p> <p>Line 19 - 22: Usually, the individuals purchase medicines over the counter (without prescription). Self-medication has been observed in all kinds of societies regardless of region, religion, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Self-care is defined as an ability of individuals to take care effectively [3].</p> <p>1) The author amended this by adding sentences to support "self-care", which is already good. Nonetheless, the fact that self-medication has been observed regardless of ethnicity is not clear in the whole introduction. "Ethnicities" is purposively mentioned in the title of the article, so the readers need to find the reasons why you chose to study them in the introduction.</p> <p>Line 43: ... medication [13]. The main objective of this study is to...</p> <p>1) The author amended this by showing what is the chief reason and secondary reason for conducting the study. 2) It is better to formulate the objectives as before revision. 3) Reviewer asked: "Before stating the objective, were there changes in regulations or special context in Malaysia to make the authors decide that it is important to assess the prevalence of self-medication in Malaysia? The same remark applies to SEGi Oral Health Centre, Malaysia". The answer to this remark was not clear in the revised paper. Only when the reader assumes that it is a burning issue amongst health professionals (from Malaysia and SEGi???) and that maybe there are no regulations.</p> <p>Line 137 - 139: The most common reason attributed to this behavior by males was lack of timing. General lack of motivation to get themselves checked by health care personals also contributed to the habit of self-medication.</p> <p>→ Author says it was amended, but seems not.</p>	<p>The manuscript has been revised according to the final evaluator instructions. All statements pointed have been revised with up to date reference citations.</p> <p>The facts have been explained in the introduction section.</p> <p>The objective has been modified as suggested.</p> <p>The statement has been added before objectives</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

- 1) If the reader tries to understand, maybe “lack of timing” and “lack of motivation...” (lines 139-141) were part of the answers of these male respondents. To be clear, author should add in the results a graph or a table summarizing the reasons why Malaysians self-medicate.
- 2) If 1) is wrong, the author gave the following explanation: “Lack of timing due to the fact that males are generally more engrossed in work related issues during day time. Thereby at the end of the day lack of energy invariably leads to taking the shortest possible path of self medication.” Author could insert these explanations with references showing these socioeconomic constraints of males.

Line 142 – 146 in revised paper: Author says it is amended, but not in a clear way. Author explained well the situation in developing countries. Still, first reviewer recommended to add a sentence highlighting Malaysia economic situation to underline the contrast found compared to African countries. Eg: Malaysia is a highly open upper-middle income economy [+ reference]. This information was not provided.

Line 146 – 149 in revised paper: “Considering the age groups, middle aged individuals were also found to be more inclined to self-medication in comparison to teenagers. It is primarily attributed to the lack of time on part of middle aged people”.

→ **Two advices to help the author structure the paper content:**

- 1) If “lack of time” is an answer given by these middle aged people, author should add a graph or table in the results to highlight this.
- 2) If not, again, a literature reference supporting this point of discussion, or at least driving the author to think about that very explanation should be marked here. No idea should be expressed without sound evidence.

Line 148 – 154: People belonging to Indian race were mostly found to involve themselves in self-medication. It was followed by individuals belonging to Malay and Chinese races. It can be attributed to the fact that Indian populations have greater believes in alternative medicine. Herbal medicines are more commonly used self-medications among Malaysian populations. The use of herbal medicine among Chinese stems from the source that most of the Chinese population has been self-medicating themselves with herbal drugs for over generations on the recommendation of their ancestors.

→ **Author answered with the following fine explanation:** “Malaysia is a multi-racial country with 3 majors races namely Malay, Chinese and Indians. Indians are mostly earlier emigrants from sub-continent region where alternative medicine have always been a common practice. Hence the same tendency is prevalent in Indian races in Malaysia”.

- 1) **This explanation sounds logical, but why isn't it clearly given in the revised paper? The explanation is not only meant for the reviewer but most of all for the readers. Please note that readers are not supposed to guess but to read and understand with fluidity, without assuming.**
- 2) **In the corrected paper: line 150 – 158: I would fully agree but there is not a single reference supporting all the statements of this paragraph. If references are unavailable, isn't there a reference drawing the author to make his reasonment that way?**

Line 196 – 198: During the course of this study the participants were also informed about the potential adverse effects of medicines as a professional duty to guide the participants towards better quality of life.

→ **This statement should be placed at the end of Methodology chapter, not at the end of conclusion.**

All related references have been cited

The statement explaining this point has been added and reference cited

All related references have been cited

The statement has been added to the revised manuscript according to the instructions. Appropriate reference has been cited for lines 150-156 and bibliography has been updated according to the journal style.

This statement has been placed at the end of Methodology chapter as advised.