



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The authors have complied with almost all suggestions of manuscript revision. However, some questions must be answered and corrected to ensure a better understanding by the reader.</p> <p>1) The objective of study was to estimate the prevalence of self-medication with antibiotics. However, the most important outcome, reported by authors, was the prevalence of antibiotics use in the last 6 months = 82.2%. In my way of thinking the most important result of the study should be "A little more than half (50.8%) participant self-medicated with antibiotics". Because it is the answer to the purpose of the study. I would like the authors made it clear. What is the prevalence of self-medication with antibiotics?</p> <p>2) The authors assert that respondents with occupation related to health care were excluded from the study (line 97-98). But in the "Result section" (line 219-221) they say: "There was statistically significant difference between self-medication practices of those healthcare and non-healthcare related professionals (p=0.005)." However, 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 information becomes questionable.</p> <p>More minor revision comments are highlighted in the revised manuscript. The revision was made using tracked changes in Microsoft Word.</p>	<p>82.2% of respondents self-medicated with antibiotics and 82.2% is the prevalence</p> <p>This contradictory statement has been deleted. Initially thought has been removed. Sorry for mixed up</p>