



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_45725
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge Attitude and Practices towards use of unprescribed drugs among Adults of a Selected City of Somaliland
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>I liked your article and found your approach very interesting. I would like to contribute with some suggestions:</p> <p>Line 1 and line 44 – include a comma after Knowledge Knowledge, Attitude and Practices towards use....</p> <p>Line 17 – What does the KAP keyword mean?</p> <p>Line 20 to 22 – About OTC's definition, the FDA definition is valid in the US, but it is the same in your country? What about WHO definition about this, is the same as the FDA? You can choose the FDA definition, but you need to make this clear.</p> <p>Line 22 to 28 – You used the same words as Togoobaatar, but you need to say the same thing with your words or to show you are repeating Toggobaatar's words (quote). You can say: Togoobaatar's study in Mongolia found....</p> <p>Line 32 – Remove the site link. I would like to suggest to you to read about electronic document citation</p> <p>Line 32 to 39 – Are the statements relative to reference number 6? I really had doubts about this.</p> <p>Line 76 to 77 - In the third part the questionnaire have questions about "Somaliland's regulation against drug distribution and sales". In the introduction (line 40 to 45), you did not say anything about Somaliland's regulation against drug distribution and sales and their historic aspects. I would like to suggest to you to include a paragraph about this regulation history in the introduction.</p> <p>Line 49 to 51 – When you said: This study targeted adults living in Hargeisa city who were available during the study and give consent of participation and the sample size was estimated to be at least 400 individuals". What is the number of the adult population? What is the influence in the sample size?</p> <p>Line 91 - In this line you say "this table shows", but I did not see a table in your manuscript. In fact, I would like to see tables showing this information explained in findings.</p> <p>Line 130 to 133 - I suggest that you remove these lines, because you repeat the same information above in Findings.</p> <p>Line 135 – remove one '%'. Line 136 and lines 145 to 146 - I suggest that you merge and put them in the beginning of the Discussion. In this part, it is important you explain about your findings compared to others studies' findings.</p> <p>Line 143 to 145 and line 126 to 127 – These lines repeated the same information in findings and in Discussion. In Discussion, you need to compare your finding with other studies or remove this phrase.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Important questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Materials and methods (line 84 to 86): “Data was analyzed by using SPSS v.20 and MS Excel. Simple frequencies, means and standard deviations were utilized for continuous variables. Bivariate analyses like chi-square were done as appropriate”. About Bivariate analyses, I only see in Findings in line 126 to 127: “It is found that there is significant association between knowledge of the health consequences and practices of unprescribed drugs”. If you used bivariate analyses, you need to show and write about in findings and discussion. - You need to write the conclusion of the manuscript. - I did not find where you cited this reference in your text: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Norris P. Interventions to improve antimicrobial use: evidence from ICIUM 2004. School of Pharmacy, University of Otago Dunedin. 2007;75(7):75-. 9. McNulty CA, Boyle P, Nichols T, Clappison DP, Davey P. Antimicrobial drugs in the home, United Kingdom. Emerging infectious diseases. 2006 Oct;12(10):1523. 10. Friedman JF, Lee GM, Kleinman KP, Finkelstein JA. Acute care and antibiotic seeking for upper respiratory tract infections for children in day care: parental knowledge and day care center policies. Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine. 2003 Apr 1;157(4):369-74. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 56 to 68 – I suggest that you remove the calculations, they are not necessary. Line 79 to 80 – I suggest that you remove these lines, because you repeat the same information above. I think you can remove up to line 82, think about this.</p> <p>Line 90 to 91 – I suggest to change this: It is found that slightly more than two fifths (40.8%) of the respondents were male followed by around three fifths (59.3%) females.</p> <p>Line 134 to 135 – “The overall prevalence of unprescribed drug users among the respondents in our study was 64.3%”. Can you compare with world prevalence?</p>	
Optional/General comments	Line 89 – I suggest to change Findings to Results	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Salime C. Hadad</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Brazil</i>