

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_108947</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Overview of Self-Medication on the Use of Generic Drugs in Medical Faculty Students and College Students Non-Faculty of Medicine</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as the authors aimed to see the picture of self-medication regarding the use of generic drugs among students at the Faculty of Medicine and the non-medical faculty students of the Indonesian Christian University, class of 2018. They, specifically, wanted to reveal what the picture of self-medication of students is based on, how they get drugs, how they get information about drugs, how they choose them as well as students' accuracy in carrying out self-medication regarding the use of generic drugs.</p> <p>2- I think that the title needs to be more concise, I suggest, for example: Overview of Self-Medication on the Use of Generic Drugs in students of Faculty of Medicine and those with other specialties.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive and covers the most important aspects of the paper.</p> <p>4- Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate. The authors provided complete information in the introduction, however, I see that it is very long and needs to be shortened. It also needs more organization as some ideas are repeated.</p> <p>5- Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the English language writing throughout the manuscript needs improvement.</p> <p>6- Yes, the references are sufficient but recent ones are few, I think the addition of more recent references would be an advantage. Moreover, some references are incomplete (18, 20, 22, 28). In addition, the font of some references needs to be adjusted.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, I see that the English language writing throughout the manuscript needs improvement. There are many grammatical and linguistic structural mistakes that need to be revised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alaa Hassan Sayed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Medical Research and Clinical Studies Institute, National Research Centre, Egypt</b>