



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13505
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF MEDICAL TREATMENT OPTIONS AMONG RURAL PEOPLE IN SELECTED COMMUNITIES IN IMO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Short 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	1. The topic of this paper is relevant and of interest to the audience of this journal. 2. The content of this paper is technically below average 3. The abstract is average concise and sufficient 4. The introduction provides information is not sufficient for background support. 5. The research methodology for the study is not appropriate and applied properly. 6. What were the criteria for the consideration of all the selection of 637 autonomous communities in Imo state and who were the respondents and give brief explanation about the respondents. 7. You are required to mention the analysis table includes dependent and independent variables and specify each variable and its significance. 8. The results of analysis are not correctly interpreted 9. Tables are not appropriate and adequate 10. The supporting evidence in this paper is not strongly reliable and properly validated 11. Conclusion is not clearly mentioned. It need comprehensive conclusion with strong recommendations. 12. References are not complete and appropriate. It is very general in nature; it is fit for freshers in health care management.	2. This paper is made as simple as it is in order to make the contents as accessible and comprehensible, as possible to the various categories of the journals audience. 3. Ok 4. The volume of information provided in the introduction is enough for, and commensurate with, the length/scope of the paper. 5. We do not understand what you mean by this as there are no suggestions made. However, we have improved on the methodology. 6. A two-stage Stratified Random Sampling Technique was employed where the first stage was Local Government Areas (two Local Governments each from the three senatorial zones were randomly selected) and the communities the second stage. The 64 autonomous communities studied constitute approximately 10% of the 637 autonomous communities in Imo State. The autonomous communities were also randomly selected based on the proportion of autonomous communities in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13. 2.2 - Need not mention first three paragraph of 'Operationalization of concepts' in this manuscript 14. 4. Discussion: The entire paragraph in the Discussion section should be come in Data analysis.	the Local Governments selected. The respondents were economically active adults, aged 20-64, and within the communities studied who basically make health decisions in their families. 7. Comment not clear please. 8. How? Please the assessor should say what is lacking or wrong and suggest correct options. 9. Tables are not appropriate in what sense? Suggest correction, please. 10. Which supporting evidence, please? 11. We have re-written the conclusion. 12. Is there any definite number of references required? Otherwise, how are the "completeness" and "incompleteness" determined? 13. We disagree with this comment. The three paragraphs are there to clearly explain concepts in the work. 14. The arrangement in the paper responded to the prescribed style of the journal as seen in an example of a published article in the journal.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Sample size has not been justified and it has not been arrived in right method. It lacks with statistical tools and usage.	The sample size was calculated with recourse to the estimated proportion approach (Kothari, 2004) since the total population of economically active adults in the three senatorial zones is not known. However, we made use of projected proportion of economically active adults from the 2006 Nigerian census and hence the sample size was calculated from the formula: $n = \left(\frac{Z_{\alpha}}{e} \right)^2 p(1 - p)$ Where: n = sample size Z = value of standard normal variate corresponding to α e = acceptable error in a given situation. p = estimated proportion or incidence of cases in the population. Using the above formula with $\alpha = 10\%$, $e = 0.035$, $p = 0.418$, we obtained $n = 540$