



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31413
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of malaria treatment seeking behaviour among urban and rural households in north central Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction Malaria is “malaria”, definitely, having an inexhaustible source of aspects to be investigated especially regarding the availability, accessibility, affordability to treatment seeking behavior in developing countries. The present research clarifies a bit more about the constraints that Benue State as well as some countries still have to face in order to eliminate Malaria. This is a reason to congratulate the authors for that. Anyway, I would like to share with them some minor concerns: 1. TITLE (Lines 3 and 4) It reflects the problem under investigation. 2. ABSTRACT (Lines 5 to 30). It's great. However: • the period of study should also be included • The SPSS should be well defined as Version 20 (Line 19) or as Version 21 (Line 119). 3. METHODS (Line 81)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• They are appropriate and the tools for their validation were very well chosen. • No ethical statements seem to be referred. That's a very important issue, I suppose. 4. RESULTS (Line 124) The results were perfectly well presented, apart some irrelevant discrepancies. 5. DISCUSSION (Line 265) The discussion is great and convincing. 6. REFERENCES References are appropriate and sufficient. Ethical Issue- No ethical statements seem to be referred. That's a very important issue, I suppose	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Paulo Adão De Campos</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Agostinho Neto University, Angola</i>