



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_46901
Title of the Manuscript:	An Audit of Selected Prescriptions Written at The Lagos State University Teaching Hospital.
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 (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>Abstract and Title: Rather use "selected" than "some" prescriptions ...</p> <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please change citations in the manuscript to the journal requirements, i.e. within square brackets [1] and not as superscripts as is currently the case. Please check the citation number used on page 7, second line. <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the heading "Research method and Design", should be included the cross-sectional design applied, currently it is only mentioned in the abstract. It is not clear how the researcher implemented the convenience sampling. Please elaborate. Preferably refer to "capturing" data rather than "imputed." The journal requires P values to be an uppercase, italicised <i>P</i>. Please visit http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/69/authors-instruction to correct the use throughout in this manuscript. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are more results in the abstract and discussion than in the Results section; and there is no indication of significant results to prove whether the null hypothesis could be rejected or not. However, a statement regarding the hypothesis ends the Discussion. What was the purpose of having a theoretical framework (Health Belief Model) if it was not explained or applied? <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence should be substantiated with a reference. A significant finding was referred to on page 16 without any statistical proof. Consider changing the word "significant" to "outstanding" or something similar. <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results might have been affected by several shortcomings in the study (as described on page13 and several subsequent pages) e.g. use of only a fee-paying pharmacy – these should be included as study limitations. 	<p>Although the title had been changed to the reviewer's suggestion, consecutive prescription sheets presented at the fee-pharmacy was used, they were not selected.</p> <p>This correction has been effected</p> <p>The sampling method has been better explained, other corrections has been effected.</p> <p>The observation of the reviewer appear so because because table I has a lot of information, however all the results mentioned in the abstract are in the result section.</p> <p>The theoretical framework part has been expunged from the manuscript</p> <p>This correction has been effected</p> <p>This has been incorporated</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The study provides insights into the degree to which selected prescriptions at a Nigerian hospital complied to the WHO guidelines. A short background was provided. The study used a suitable design; and methods applied were well described. However, more information should be given how sampling was done to enable reproduction of this study. Although little information is provided on the compilation of the questionnaire, the instrument was pre-tested and adjusted where necessary. In some instances, more details regarding methods and results were provided in the abstract than in these sections of the manuscript and should be corrected. In the discussion, comparisons have been made of findings to those reported in literature. Noteworthy recommendations were made to improve compliance of prescriptions in the study setting to that of the WHO guidelines.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and observation. All the corrections have been done.</p>



PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Lagos State University teaching Hospital.