SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_41764**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Comparative Analysis of Patients' Medicine Prices in a Public Teaching Hospital and Private Retail Community Pharmacy in a Rural Community in the South East 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)

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	**The manuscript examines a relevant theme, makes a significant contribution on a subject matter underexplored in economic literature, is written in readable form, includes an instructive material for the reader, has its origin in a meritorious research and its structure fits well to a regular article.** **Nevertheless, with respect to the sections METHODS and RESULTS, can be considered the opportunity to:** **(a) examine the classification of the study as a prospective study in line 95;** **(b) explain the criterion implicit in the statement "A total of 30 pharmaceuticals products were selected for the survey based on the area disease burden for data collection." of line 109;** **(c) explain the method used to calculate the median price collected for October 2014 of each medicine listed in Table 1 in both pharmacies surveyed, specifically clarifying whether were calculated simple averages or averages weighted by the quantities sold;** **(d) explain = 0.871 in line 146; and** **(e) confirm data for Methyldopa 250mg tab in Table 1.** **Considering the major revision suggested, the manuscript may be accepted for publication as a Regular Article.**	(a) The study was a prospective one because the data was collected prospectively at the time of the study. (b) This observation has been addressed (c) The median price of each drug was not calculated, remember that only one hospital pharmacy and community pharmacy was used for the study, so it is practically impossible to calculate median prices for each drug. The calculated was the overall median of the 19 drugs found in both hospital pharmacy and community pharmacy. The Mann Whitney U test (non-parametrtic test) was used to compare the overall medicine price of the two groups. (d) P = 0.087 means P >0.05(no difference) (e) No problem was identified with data for Methyldopa 250mg (it was due to the table running through 2 pages)
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		