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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	TITLE: Prevalence of Self-Medication Practice among Secondary School Students in Ekiti-State, Southwest Nigeria. A critical analysis of the title would prove that *getting the prevalence is not the only aim of a/this study.* Whatever the prevalence, responding to the other research questions would have been done. Some authors do not even mention "prevalence" as an objective of their study, though a relevant research questions!!! Reason for this remains in the fact that, after responding to objectives 2 and 3 of the present study, prevalence is almost "automatically" picked… So I propose to find a statement gathering all the information looked for in all the research questions of the study, or just say for instance: "Self-Medication Practice among Secondary School Students in Ekiti-State, Southwest Nigeria." DISCUSSION Lines 193-200: after comparing the results with those of other studies, could we discuss/enlighten the reasons that could explain these similarities or differences? (WHY DOES AGE HAVE INFLUENCE ON SELF MEDICATION? This is one of the core businesses of our study, then it should be fully discussed).	

Minor REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION Lines 35-47 (definition of non-responsible self-medication): to be written after lines 48-56. The statements on the factors influencing prevalence of non-responsible self-medication are driven from the reasons why developed countries can self-medicate responsibly (Reference: Talevi, 2010 should be written first, only then can we suggest the probability of an opposite situation in developing countries). Lines 87-88: "The practice of non-responsible self-medication among secondary school students seems to be on the increase." From which references could we state this? The idea/fact/assumption should be supported by one or more related references between brackets. Lines 92-93: Purposes: please mention in Ekiti-State, Southern Nigeria. RESEARCH METHODS (lines 107-118) 1) Were there any inclusion/exclusion criteria? 2) As a comment: Research methods are not quite clear… Simple random sampling technique is suitable for this study in order to get a representative sample. Nevertheless we could have used a random sampling technique with two-stage cluster; first selecting the secondary schools (here we do not know whether all or just some secondary schools in Ekiti State were selected for instance); then selecting the classes/levels of the students, assuming the higher the class, the older the students, AND we are taking age into account in our study so it might have been interesting to proceed considering class level and age.	

	3) All in all, the methodology is consistent with the work project and is actually likely to bring "an" answer to the questions raised in the introduction. RESULTS Line 159: "This denotes that the hypothesis is not significant". It would be more accurate to state: "The difference is not (statistically) significant". *This issue should be discussed in the discussion chapter thereafter.* DISCUSSION Line 122: Table 1: I think p-values should be inserted in table 1, at least with the variable "age" (discussed in line 175-176 for instance) and "sex". Lines 175-178: here the results are *just compared* with those from the literature. **It would be better to try to explain WHY these similarities and/or differences were noted.** Eg: because of differences in the study design? Because studied populations had different general characteristics such as a higher number of women or teens of an age group… CONCLUSION 1) Lines 206-208: "Though there was no significant difference between male and female in the practice but a significant relationship was found to exist between age and the practice of self-medication". Perhaps we should write : - **Though** there was no significant difference between male and female in the practice, ~~but~~ a significant relationship was found to exist between age and the practice of self-medication".	

	- **Or There** was no significant difference between male and female in the practice **but** a significant relationship was found to exist between age and the practice of self-medication". 2) The findings are actually justified by the results, though the discussion could have been enriched by insisting on the issues raised in this review. 3) All cited references are ok: they relate the information stated in the article, they are up-to-date and well presented.	
Optional/General comments	Lines 96-97: The study aimed at (i) determining whether secondary school students engage in selfmedication~~. It also identified~~ (ii) identifying the factors influencing self-medication as well as the sources through which they obtain the drugs~~. Lastly, it investigated~~ (iii) investigating the influence of gender and religion on practice of self-medication Line 215: What about the role of the pharmacist (person who sells the drugs over the counter)?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Barbara Elyan Edwige Vololonarivelo**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine of Antananarivo, Madagascar**