

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96173
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Addictive Behavior Among University Students
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript provided more reinforcing evidence to existing knowledge on drug use, abuse, and possible risk factors that instigate drug addictive behaviours. Thus, it is scientifically relevant, with a superficial evidence due to its descriptive nature.</p> <p>Not very suitable; "Prevalence of Addictive Substance Use Among University Students" should be more appropriate. There exists substance and non-substance addictions. Researcher focused on substances. Behaviour of the student-users wasn't studied; only the use-rate and reasons for use were studied according to the article.</p> <p>. 'To determine drug addiction' (line 2) was stated as part of the study's purpose. Drug addiction was not measured. The terms 'Prevalence rate of drugs' (line 3) and 'predictors of drug' (line 3) were used. I believe researcher may be implying prevalence rate of substance use (since Cannabis isn't part of the psychotropic drugs), and predictors of substance use. Cannabis was presented as if different from other psychotropics (line 6). Researcher should have explicitly stated psychotropic drugs. The researcher needed to link to this purpose by stating clearly within the Abstract what the predictors are. The predictors were stated but weren't clearly linked.</p> <p>Not all were appropriate. 'The different types of use', 'Factors that may change how drug works', and 'Toxicity of the different drugs used' were topics treated under 'Discussion (of Findings)'. They should have been moved to the Introduction, or a Literature Review section created for them after the Introduction. Apart from this, the rest of the structure is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, its findings are supportive of other established empirical findings.</p> <p>30 references are sufficient, but majority are not recent. Only six references cited were published within the last seven years.</p> <p>Suggestion of Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wei-Lin, C. and Jen-Hao, C., College fields of study and substance use. BMC Public Health, 2020. 1631. Gurcan, S., A study on substance abuse prevention. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education, 2017. 13(6): p. 2485 - 2504. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Page 2, line 8; suggestion: 'remain scarcely studied' may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Page 3, line 10 ; suggestion : 'prevalence rates' is a more conventional clause than prevalences.</p> <p>Page 3, line 11 ; suggestion : '...whereas other...'</p> <p>Page 8, line 9 ; suggestion : 'predominance'</p> <p>Page 11, line 8 ; what does 6 stand for? What sort of rating?</p> <p>Page 13, line 13 ; student or students?</p> <p>Page 13, line 16 ; by using « activities », it suggests that the researcher has already implemented the recommendations? If no, why not use « suggestions, conclusions, or recommendations » in place of activities.</p> <p>Page 13, lines 18 – 23 ; should be properly bulleted. Probably, another word processor, different word processor format or an older version was used in typing the document.</p> <p>Page 13, line 20 ; isn't it more professional to use 'control' in lieu of 'weaning'?</p> <p>Page 14 ; conclusion : high consumption of drugs among university students should not be the only key findings touched in this section. What about others ? What synergy do all the findings or discussions</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	form?	
--	-------	--

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:	Adiele, Ikenna Tonna
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria