



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>Interesting subject, the novelty is good. Indeed, there are some modifications to be taken into consideration concerning the presentation, method, results, and discussion</p> <p>1. Concerning introduction: Please put the hypothesis of the study.</p> <p>2. Concerning method: Please give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Data collection: please give information about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Variables: explain how each variable was defined / computed/ recoded (please note that the questionnaire was not standardized). - How were the validity and reliability of the questionnaire tested? - Were the reasons for self-medication assessed according to a list or declared by the respondents? - - How was the ethnicity defined? - How were the respondents approached to collect data? - Non-inclusion criteria: The author wrote: <p>-93 Respondents under 18 and those with occupation related to health care were not included in this 94 study.:</p>	<p>Correction done</p> <p>Tested through pilot-test</p> <p>According to a list</p> <p>Respondents approached through head of the PHC facilities</p> <p>It was a typographical error in typing. Wanted to type > instead of <</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>-191 ...There was statistically significant difference between self-medication practices of those 192, healthcare and non-healthcare related professionals ($p=0.005$): please explain</p> <p>3. Concerning results:</p> <p>a. How were the missing values approached</p> <p>b. Please correct the following results or explain clearly:</p> <p>i. Verify the prevalence of self-medication: (50.8%) or (59.9%) The author wrote: ...A little more than half (50.8%) participant cited that they had used antibiotics through 137 self-medication to treat their illnesses. And ...153 (59.9%) of Nigerians in the study area had self-medicated themselves with antibiotics.</p> <p>ii. $p>0.05$ = statistically significance...? The authors wrote: ..Self-medication 188 practices of participants <u>were significantly</u> affected by level of education ($p=0.03$), current 189 health status ($p=0.42$), gender ($p=0.7$), and duration of stay in the study area ($p=0.4$):</p> <p>$p>0.05$: no statistically significance found between the Self-medication 188 practices of participants and the above variables (except education).</p> <p>iii. The authors wrote: In table 1: the % of males = 52.3%</p>	<p>The prevalence is 82.2%</p> <p>Correction effected in the text and table</p> <p>Correction effected</p> <p>Correction effected. See table</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The author put:128 Niger State, Nigeria. Out of 1150 participants, majority (61.1%) were males: please explain!!!</p> <p>iv. The authors wrote: ...Our finding is similar to that 264 of other studies where antibiotic usage is associated with gender: But : in table 3, concerning relationship between self-medication with antibiotics and gender, the p value =0.53.</p> <p>v. Concerning Table 5. The total of the percentage of columns must be equal to 100 for each variable: please explain (and correct), and put the frequency</p> <p>Same remark for 150 Sources of Information: the author wrote: ...The major sources of antibiotic for self-medication without prescription 151 were drug stores (91.5%), chemist shops (85.7%) & pharmacy (89.5%)</p> <p>vi. 128 Median age of the 129 participants was 25 years (range 19-38). In table 1 the author put a category of age: 344 age >38: please explain.</p> <p>vii. Concerning Multivariate analysis: * Concerning Table 3. Multivariate analysis of factors that may influence self-medication with antibiotics for treatment of ailments:</p> <p>- The p values were <0.05; but the OR =1 is included in the 95% CI. Please explain. "According to theory: If the 95% confidence interval for the OR contains 1.0, the association is not</p>	<p>Corrected pls</p> <p>The p-value is 0.0053</p> <p>Multiple responses will not make the column be 100</p> <p>Age range is 19-48</p> <p>Correction done</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>significant at the 0.05 level".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please put the results of: the intercept, and R2 and p-value of the model. <p>** The results of multivariate analysis were not in line with the results of univariate analysis: please explain/correct? or discuss the results.</p> <p>The authors wrote: ..Cough with 160 productive mucus (30.1%), Sore throat (23.7%), Un-remitting fever (20.7%), dysuria (10.6%) 161 skin sepsis (7.5%), and vaginal discharge (7.4%) were the most frequent indications for the use 162 of self-medicated antibiotics.</p> <p>....In this study, 270 self-medication was as a result of participants having cough with productive mucus (30.1%),.....</p> <p>271 These ailments were the most frequent indications for the use of self273 medicated antibiotics.</p> <p>But:</p> <p>In multivariate analysis: the OR were <1 : "An OR of less than 1 means that the patient with productive mucus, or..... was <i>less</i> likely to experience the self-medication".</p> <p>4. Concerning Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerning LIMITATIONS: please put the paragraph in the paragraph discussion: L 295. - Not necessary to put a title for this paragraph (LIMITATIONS). - Please discuss the method of data collection (declared self-medication vs. list) - Discuss the novelty of this study: compare with others recent studies 	<p>Correction done</p> <p>Correction done</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>5. Concerning References Please put references for the following paragraphs:</p> <p>219 Self-medication would be acceptable.... 224.</p> <p>231....236</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. Please put a table concerning the results of 133 <i>Past experiences with antibiotics self-Medication</i>: And the results concerning the paragraph 186.... 199</p> <p>2. Some sentences were duplicated, to be avoided, or please reformulate when appropriate :</p> <p>Use of antibiotics within the past 12 months 134 was reported by 945 (82.2%) clinic attendees without medical prescription.</p> <p>...When asked about the self-medicated use of antibiotics, 154 82.2% reported that they had used 155 antibiotics without medical prescription at least one time in the past 12 months.</p> <p>A little more than half (50.8%) participant cited that they had used antibiotics through 137 self-medication to treat their illnesses. And -This study demonstrated that an appreciably high percentage 153 (59.9%) of Nigerians in the study area had self-medicated themselves with antibiotics</p> <p>This study demonstrated that an appreciably high percentage (59.9%) of Nigerian rural dwellers had 243 self-medicated themselves with antibiotics, whereas the percentage of those who ever did so is even 244 higher (82.2%).</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. Please replace: 188 practices of participants were significantly affected by level of education ($p=0.03$) : by $p=0.03$</p> <p>4. Concerning Table 2: please put the results of the CI as percentage.</p> <p>5. Concerning tables: 3 and 5 : please put the frequencies (#) of responses</p> <p>6. Concerning 333 Education level: Primary , Secondary and Tertiary... please explain what did you mean by tertiary, or put # of years of education</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>7. Please avoid the use of the word Ironically ...189 Ironically: please replace by: controversially.</p> <p>8. Concerning 350 Marital Status...: Are there no widowed subjects?</p> <p>9. In table 2 put the same presentation of results: as percentage "Confidence Interval: 0.20-0.27; Prevalence: 24.1"</p>	