

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_99424
Title of the Manuscript:	PRESCRIPTION PATTERN OF ANTIBIOTICS IN PRIVATE HEALTHCARE FACILITIES IN PORT HARCOURT METROPOLIS, RIVERS STATE.
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, it is. 2. No, it is not. The author should add the type of study (a survey, not antibiotic use data) in the title to hinder misinterpretation. 3. No, it is not. The author should provide information about the questionnaire detail, i.e. the development process, domain, number of questions, and the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. The author's recommendation in the conclusion section is not drawn from the data. The result is about doctor perspective. The author should give a recommend statement to solve this situation. 4. Yes, it is. 5. No, it is not. Introduction: The author should explain reason assessing doctor perspective rather than calculating antibiotic use from doctor's prescribing. Method: The author should provide questionnaire for data collection. The author should provide information about the questionnaire detail, i.e. the development process, domain, number of questions, the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, data collection and analysis. 6. No, it is not. The author should add references to support this issue (explain reason assessing doctor perspective rather than calculating antibiotic use from doctor's prescribing) and revise method section subsequently.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article needs proofreading by a native speaker.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fauna Herawati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Surabaya, Indonesia