



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_25268
Title of the Manuscript:	Self-medication with antibiotics: Empirical evidence from Nigerian rural population
Type of the 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	<p>A few comments about the "methodology" section: The authors did not clearly describe which variables were collected. They only report self-medication (At any time in life, and self-medication by their family members).</p> <p>How did the authors ensure that the participants were actually from Niger rural population? I suggest change the perspective of the study. It can not be guaranteed that it was evaluated the prevalence of rural population of Niger State, but they can guarantee that it was assessed the prevalence of self-medication in a rural area of Niger State.</p> <p>A few comments about the "result" section: They did not report how was handled questionnaires with missing data. The questionnaires with missing data are excluded from the analysis? I recommend design a flowchart of study participants.</p> <p>I'm doubt about questions regarding the recall period used.</p> <p>There are 82.2% participants using antibiotics in the past 12 months. Further, the authors reported that the same 82.2% of participants used antibiotics in their lifetime and 53.4% of those have used antibiotics without a prescription.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand what is the prevalence of self-medication and what was the recall period</p>	<p>The variables have been described in the text</p> <p>Only participants who permanently reside in Niger state with a minimum stay of 2 years were recruited into the study.</p> <p>Questionnaire were manually checked for missing data and those with missing data were returned for proper completion.</p> <p>The recall period was 6 months.</p> <p>The prevalence of the self-medication was 82.2%. All necessary correction done in the text.</p>

	<p>used. I request the authors to improve the description of these two items. It is unclear how the prevalence of self-medication was evaluated. The recall period used was the past 12 months? Or at any time in life? I guess that was used at any time in life as recall period (see at method section). The authors are confused when they demonstrate the prevalence of self-medication. What is the correct result: 53.4% or 50.8% or 59.9%? The authors are saying that self-medication practices of participants were significantly affected by gender, but the p-value was higher than 0.05, so there is not statistical difference between male and female in self-medication practice. How was this information collected? The authors not included in the study respondents with occupation related to health care. As there were no health professionals interviewed, the highlighted information becomes questionable. Please explain. (see at review manuscript). A few comments about tables: Table 1: At education level, The sum of the number of participants is inconsistent. $623+390+135 = 1148$ However, the total study respondents was 1150. At the section "methodology" is described: "Respondents under 18 and those with occupation related to health care were not included in this study". How is possible there is information about</p>	<p>Recall period was 6 months</p> <p>Typographical error has been corrected</p> <p>Statement corrected</p> <p>Typographical error has been corrected It is $623+390+137$</p> <p>Correction done</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>participants that, in theory, are not included in the study?</p> <p>If the authors excluded 44 participants under 18 of the study, all analyzes must be redone, because the final number of participants would be 1106.</p> <p>Table 3: There are two different results. The evaluation of the confidence interval indicates that there is no significant difference between the presence / absence of symptoms. However, the value $p = 0.02$ indicates a statistically significant difference between the presence / absence of symptoms.</p> <p>This difference in results is impossible.</p> <p>Please, redone the analyses.</p> <p>Table 4: At the section "methodology" is described: "Respondents under 18 and those with occupation related to health care were not included in this study".</p> <p>How is possible there is information about participants that, in theory, are not included in the study?</p> <p>Table 5: In this study, the confidence interval is a range of possible values for the magnitude of the prevalence. However, the confidence intervals are not containing the prevalence.</p> <p>The authors must reevaluate these confidence intervals.</p> <p>(See more recommendations in the revised manuscript)</p> <p>Ethical Issues</p>	<p>Correction done</p> <p>Necessary correction done as suggested</p> <p>Correction done as suggested</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Yes. "Approval was obtained from the officer-in-charges of the PHC facilities and informed consent from the participants".</p>	<p>Concerning the ethical issues, sorry for the omission. I want to restate that, there is no ethical review committee where the study was carried out. In view of this, what was done regarding this was to obtain approval from the officer in-charge of the HFs and and informed consent from the participants. In addition, detailed explanation was also given to the participants about the aim and the objective of the study. Participants were also informed that their participation was voluntary and they are free to withdraw their participation at any time they so wish without any punitive sanction. Fortunately, none of the participants withdrew from the study. Finally, participants were also assured of confidentiality treatment of all information provided in the course of the study.</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors did not inform how they worked the possible bias in the study. If they did not use some strategies to avoid bias, they should describe it in the limitations.</p> <p>The authors did not inform if there were questionnaires excluded from the analysis and they did not report how they handled questionnaires with missing data.</p> <p>Was it applied a method for verifying the authenticity of the questionnaire responses?</p> <p>I did not see in the methods and in the results the description that the authors collected socioeconomic information on all participants. They should clearly describe which variables were collected in the methodology and they should describe this result in the manuscript.</p> <p>(See more recommendations in the revised manuscript)</p>	<p>See text on strategies used to avoid bias. Also described in the limitations</p> <p>Correction done as suggested</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>(See more recommendations in the revised manuscript)</p>	