



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_50537
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of Participatory Learning and Action on strengthening the different domains of empowerment on self-medication with antimicrobials in Nyalenda Informal Settlement, Kisumu County, Kenya
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>Interesting theme! Some comments were made in order to contribute to the authors:</p> <p>1 - The Abstract (Summary) doesn't clearly and accurately describe the content of the article. There is no information regarding the type of study. (Check the Journal abstract example): http://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines (Aims; Study design; Methodology; Results and Conclusion.</p> <p>2 – Keywords: Immediately after the abstract, about 4-8 keywords should be given. The manuscript only has 3 keywords.</p> <p>3- The manuscript goes beyond the word limit (6,580), considering the journal norms which are: We advise a length of 3000-6000 words (including everything).</p> <p>4- The references aren't in the norms of the Journal. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. Rewrite! Check the examples: http://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines</p> <p>5- The methods aren't described comprehensively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There isn't information regarding the type of study. - First paragraph of Methods, better specify the type of service (example: private, public, ...) offered to society. - Specify best how the transcription of the report is performed and how the result is released. - What level of significance was adopted in this study to reject the null hypothesis? - What parameters were used in the comparative analysis? - What are the Risks and Limitations for the Study? <p>6- Throughout the text, results, write percentages between parentheses and absolute numbers out of parentheses.</p> <p>7- There are few interpretations and conclusions justified by the results. Discuss the results found with other references. The first paragraph of the Discussion should include the most relevant findings of the study.</p> <p>8- Conclusion: A clear and unique conclusion of the authors is needed. In addition, in both all topics and in the own Conclusion, the authors need to clarify their positions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Very interesting article for self-medication with antimicrobials. Studies about self-medication with antimicrobials are important and can contribute to the best knowledge in this public health problem.. The manuscript contains new and significant information to justify publication.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Interesting study and theme. However, it is necessary to clarify the topics and to make a brief conclusion from the authors' point of view.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Diego Zapelini do Nascimento</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Southern Santa Catarina, Brazil</i>