



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAMPS_16083
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Self-Medication Practice among Secondary School Students in Ekiti-State, Southwest Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The manuscript needs a lot of revisions and modifications to meet the standard set by Advance in Medical and Pharmaceutics journal. <u>A. Abstract</u> 1. The methodology was illustrated as combination of stratified random sampling in abstract section but it differs with that illustrated in methodology section where paper has indicated that study design constitutes simple random sampling only. 2. Please kindly note that the abstract section does not possess any numerical data as major findings of the research. It is our strong recommendation to you to please integrate the significant study findings of the research in precise numerical results. It is believed that abstract is the core of the research paper so it is mandatory to include the significant results of the statistical analysis of generated data descriptively or inferentially or both based on statistical design of the study. 3. Please note that some texts are italicized and some text are in non-italicized form while including recommendation in abstract section. Please make all the text uniform. 4. Please include study period of your research.	The methodology has been modified The numerical data have been included in the findings Every word in the abstract has be italicized Study time included



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. We wonder why it is indicated prevalence of non-responsible self medication while highlighting objectives of the research but there is no such illustration while formulating research question and title of research. Also, please clear what criteria were set to call self medication practice to be non-responsible? It is humble request to modify the abstract with author guidelines supplied by Science Domain International. 6. Please refer the author guidelines of the journal http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors and kindly note these points. a. The major findings of the research with important data were missing from the abstract section. b. It is recommended not just to say “there was significant difference between the group” in result section but demanded to supply with more elaborated descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. c. Please separate the abstract section in different sub-sections including research objective, method and techniques used, major findings and results, and conclusion. No such discretion was found. 7. It is our strong recommendation to include significant aspects of research design and elements demanded by publisher in abstract section rather than including general aspect like “we have done literature review”.	Prevalence of non-responsible self medication has been deleted Abstract modified to author’s guidelines Major findings now included Descriptive and inferential statistics now well reported Abstract now in sub-sections Same has been included
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Introduction</u> 1. Please note that the reference style that you have followed is not according to the guidelines of the publisher. It is strongly suggested you to have your referencing in Vancouver style but you have followed entirely different referencing style. Also, cite the references with number not author and date as indicated. Please consider my suggestion kindly and do what is to be done. 2. The referencing system: the referencing should be uniform. In the text, somewhere it was written like (Almasdy, 2011) and somewhere like Almasdy (2011). Please consider it. 3. It would be great if you have explained the research question in explanatory form rather than pointing in question form. 4. Also the purpose of the study needs to be explained in introduction in explanatory form rather than pointing out separately. <u>B. Method</u> The method section also needs to go through a lot of corrections and revisions. 1. Please kindly mention duration of study in method section. 2. You have not detailed how the sample size was derived, what is population size of your study and what is your plan of generalizing your finding with	The guidelines has been followed and References now in Vancouver Corrected Done Done Done Duration has been mentioned Comprehensive explanation of how the sample was derived has been done
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	appropriate statistical tools. Since the study is prevalence study, it is strongly demanded to have appropriated so that generalization could be made relevantly. 3. Similarly, please kindly note that the article has mentioned descriptive analysis in method section but the result section has been adorned with inferential analysis like ANOVA and t-test. 4. If we are not wrong the questionnaires were self administered so it is strongly recommended to have written consent of participant not just the school administration. It is them who have the actual right of their information. And please clear whether the consent was written or verbal. 5. Also, chi square test has not employed in statistical analysis of data discovered. If it was not intended to apply chi square test, please it should not be mentioned in method section and table head of table of table no.1. 6. You have not mention whether the data were analysed manually or using standard statistical application like SPSS, Excel etc. Please consider this point. 7. Please specify why 20 participants were excluded .I mean what the exclusion criteria for excluding these 20 participants were. <u>C. Result</u> 1. Chi square was included on explaining table heading of table No.1 but I have not found any chi square test in the result table.	Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used The verbal consent of both participants and the school authority were obtained Chi-square not used. The error has been corrected Data were analysed with SPSS 17.0 version The twenty excluded were used in pilot survey Error has been corrected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. The table no. 2 needs to have proper alignment as some content is in one page and some content is in another page. 3. Please note that the table heading of table no.3 has been highlighted. Please avoid such highlighting. It is strongly recommended not to have such highlights. There is no need to give description of term like analgesic (pain reliever). 4. There is no need to repeat hypothesis in result section. The hypothesis could be critically explained with the analysis of result obtained. 5. Please clarify why text has used none group in table no.4. If you intended that this group of students used no self medication then you could simply exclude it being illustrated from the table. 6. The expression of p value is not in accordance with author's guideline. It needs to italicized and capitalized and note this quote from author's guidelines "Correct expression: (<i>P</i> = .05). Wrong Expression: (<i>P</i> < .05), unless <i>P</i> < .001." 7. Please note this quote from author's guideline "It is suggested that the discussion about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures. No tables or figures should be given without discussion or reference inside the text". You have presented the discussion of table in the text after the appearance of the respective table.	Done Highlights and unnecessary description have been removed Hypothesis removed in result presentation None group has been excluded Correct expression done $P=0.05$ Done Correction done
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. The inferential statistical analysis was separately presented in result section and it was presented as simple statistical problem solving style .It is our strong recommendation to integrate the hypothesis testing with table no.1,2 and 3 showing whether the findings are statistically significant or not. 9. It is strongly recommended to apply chi square test since the result are non parametric. <u>D. Discussion</u> 1. I may be wrong but the discussion section is short. Please consider more elaboration in discussion section with critical interpretation from you. There is a lot of area needs to be critically interpreted in result section. It is strongly demanded to highlight and explain the serious findings of your study i.e. the prevalence of self medication was common in the age group 10-14 years and most common drug prevailed were antibiotics and analgesic. The rational thinking and educational level of these age group people is not enough to practice self medication .As antibiotic has an issue of resistance and analgesic drugs has an issue of misuse and abuse, these findings need to critically explained. If the intention of the article is that such finding correlated with non responsible self medication then it should be clearly explained. 2. Please note the referencing and citing style should be done according to guideline of the author in Vancouver style. 3. As per our discretion, the discussion section needs	The statistical tool used is frequency and percentage Extensive discussion done Explanation done Done
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to have critical interpretation from author himself/himself. The article has attempted to interpret its findings with available literature but the self interpretation input from author themselves has been lacking.	Done
	<u>E. Conclusion</u> 1. You have mentioned that many pain reliever falls under the category of stimulant class of psychoactive class which was not illustrated in result section and neither has it been critically interpreted in discussion section because these are controlled substance and possess potentiality of abuse and misuse. <u>Please not that the article is missing the following sections:</u> <u>a. Author contribution section,</u> <u>b. acknowledge section and</u> <u>c. declaration of completing interests section.</u> <u>F. References</u> <u>Please refer this quote from author guideline of publisher "References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference</u>	Corrected All included Reference done to agree with Vancouver style of referencing



SDI Review Form 1.6

	number in brackets [3].” You are following different referencing and citation style which needs to seriously revise according to publisher’s guidelines. It is strongly recommended to follow the Vancouver style as the Journal of Advance in Medical and Pharmaceutics is processing to be indexed in NCBI. <u>Ethical Consideration</u> Since the information is supplied by respondents for constituting the primary data as you indicated, it is strongly mandatory to have written consent from the respondents themselves rather than school authority only. Please note that it is mandatory in author’s guidelines given by publisher. The ethical issue needs more clarification. It has been indicated that consent was taken from school authority but it is not cleared whether the consents were written or verbal. We strongly hold that the consents must be taken from the respondents in written form signed by them as they have primary right on the information they supplied. The text is silent on it.	Verbal consent done
--	--	---------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Please consider line no 179(the analgesic not that analgesic). 2. Please consider line no 215 and 216 was not found relevant. I may be wrong but the lines need to be modified justifiably. 3. Please consider line no 50, 51 and 52.The sentences needs more clarification. 4. Please refer line no.112.It was stated informant from respondents but it needs to be information. 5. Please note line no 134 to 138 while explaining the table no.2. There no full stops, commas or any sentence breakage. It is all continuous throughout the paragraph hence found difficult to discriminate. Further such mistakes have been reported in many instances while explaining the table in result section.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Grammatical and spelling consideration: 1. Literature instead of literatures-line no.11. 2. Comprised of instead of composed of because it is not accepted in standard English-line no 12. 3. In the form of instead of in form of-line no 28.	