



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	OBSERVATIONS 1. The idea and purpose of the write up were noble. However, there was so much incoherence in the pattern of presentation. 2. Some of the statements appear where they should not thereby causing disruptions in the flow of information. 3. Some of the statements were disjointed and incompletely made. 4. Some aspects of the manuscript appear to be an official report on rivalry between health professionals (Pharmacists vs. Medical Doctors). 5. The general structuring of the paper was poor. RECOMMENDATIONS 1. The author should be advised to • carry out a more in-depth studies using established facts • do a proper design and better articulation of the work so as to bring out the import of	Lines 75 to 151, 153 to 189 have been re-written for better flow of the presentation as indicated. This has taken care of the disjointed and incomplete statements. The aspect of the report, which looked like official report, has been removed and well corrected to take care of any form of bias. The general structure and design has been upgraded. The text has been redesigned with additional inputs and methods inclusive which was omitted earlier.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the work.	All the highlighted areas has also been well addressed, rewritten and well structured and articulated for better understanding.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		