



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25950
Title of the Manuscript:	DRUG REVOLVING FUND AND ESSENTIAL DRUG MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Minireview paper

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	The abstract slightly describes the methodology used which is missing in the paper. The authors need to insert a section on methodology used in identifying the studies (inclusion and exclusion criteria). Since it is a mini-review paper, there is a need of including other search engines e.g. PubMed, Hinari, etc. The introduction is supposed to have a guiding objective as to why this review was done. This give readers and incentive to continue reading the paper Plagiarism issue : Line 186-201: It seems this section is 'word by word' from the Book titled: Management Sciences for Health 2012. MDS-3: Managing Access to Medicines and Health Technologies. 3rd ed. Arlington, VA. Management Sciences for Health. (Chapter 13)	The methodology has been captured as indicated and the inclusion/exclusion criteria have been indicated. The guided objective aspect of the introduction has been added as indicated The Management Sciences for Health 2012. MDS-3: Managing Access to Medicines and Health Technologies. 3rd ed. Is just one of the tests used, it has been well written taking plagiarism into consideration. The test has already been checked for plagiarism.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is a need to check minor spelling and grammatical errors some of which have been highlighted.	The minor errors and grammatical errors have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Comments C1 to C26 have been well taken. The reviewer's comments have been clearly addressed and rewritten to soothe the reviewers request for better understanding. The title has also been modified t catch the objective vividly. Many thanks for the constructive review.