



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	Although the topic under consideration is one that has the potential to shed light on some of the factors that influence health seeking behaviour among the study population, the study was poorly done. The authors failed to apply the basics rules of scientific research and did not present the work in a scientific way. Some examples are highlighted below: ABSTRACT 1. The abstract should start with background information in two or three sentences. 2. The study setting is not department of social sciences federal polytechnic Nekede. The study setting is the various communities of Imo state. 3. There is no need to state place and duration of study as a separate paragraph. Mention it in your methodology. 4. There is no need to explain whether your data were categorical or not. Mention the research design used and how your data were analysed. 5. We need some specific figures in your results. 6. Your conclusion is not scientific, what are the 3 treatment options referred to? How can you conclude that such treatment options should be adopted by healthcare workers? 7. The authors seem not to understand what keywords means in scientific research. Word such as Factor, Multinomial Logistic Regression, Predictor Variable and Dependent Variable cannot be keywords. Please rewrite the keywords.	1. Accepted and corrected. 2. Accepted and corrected. 3. The authors arrangement was informed by an example of an article published in the journal. 4. It is the type of data that usually determines the method of analysis and this informed the mention of the type of data. 5. The comment is not clear. 6. How? The three treatment options (orthodox, traditional and spiritual) are clearly mentioned in the paper. It is usual that conclusions highlight major ideas and findings. 7. Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. INTRODUCTION This section is supposed to be the literature review. There is no evidence of this in the manuscript. The authors need to describe work done in the area that relates to the topic being researched. Most of the statements made are not referenced appropriately; the problem statement is riddled with assertions not backed up with reference. 2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES This section is poorly written; the Aim of a research work is the broad objective. 3. METHODOLOGY How was the questionnaire designed? Mention the study design, sampling technique, power of the study, piloting, scientific rigours, data cleaning etc. Did you obtain ethical clearance for this study? Did you get permission to conduct the study from necessary authorities? How did you ensure privacy and anonymity among your participants? 4. DATA ANALYSIS This section is riddled with data that are not well explained in the manuscript. 5. DISCUSSION The conclusion is poorly written. You need to discuss your findings in the context of the literature; unfortunately there isn't a literature review in your manuscript. Do a proper review of relevant literature first and then you will be able to discuss your findings. 6. CONCLUSION Not scientific. You cannot make this kind of conclusion with this study. 7. REFERENCES What referencing style are you using? Please consult referencing resources.	1. Please the introduction cited several literature related to the topic. However, more have been added. 2. There are two sets of objectives. The broad and the specific and the latter derived from the former. They are referenced according to the prescribed style of the journal. 3. The traditional rulers of the communities permitted the study, hence the co-operation received from their subjects/the respondents. 4. We disagree with this comment. Key results were explained. 5. The literature review is incorporated in the introduction. However, more literature review have been added and conclusion re-written. 6. We do not understand what you mean by not "being scientific". Nonetheless, the conclusion has been improved upon. 7. Accepted and corrected.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issues-: The authors failed to mention who gave them ethical clearance and how the issue of confidentiality and anonymity were addressed.	The respondents were granted confidentiality and anonymity in the last paragraph of the questionnaire and during brief interactions with them.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors need to consult experienced researchers to assist them in writing scientific article that could be published.	The authors have already published a number of scholarly articles in journals as highly reputable as Science domain.