Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_126436**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Availability and Cost-Effectiveness of Antimalarial Medicines in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Journal Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript is very important for the scientific community since the understanding of the availability of antimalarial medicines will help in identifying gaps in primary healthcare access that needs to be addressed in order to reduce mortality and morbidity associated with malaria. In addition, the findings on cost-effectives will help the government to make informed decisions on resource allocation. Furthermore, the findings will enable policy makers to prioritize spending on antimalarial medicines that are affordable and effective especially to low-income earners. Nevertheless, the findings on identifying the cost-effectives of antimalarial medicines will help to increase accessibility to affordable treatment for low-income populations who are often most affected by malaria.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes, however instead of "Cost-Effectiveness" the author could use "affordability"**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**1. The abstract is supposed to provide the clear picture of the study in nutshell; the current abstract is not comprehensive. 2. The first sentence should be deleted. No need to highlight the background information in the abstract. 3. Specific objectives are missing. 4. Delete all bolded words such as objective, results and conclusion. 5. The methodology part is not satisfactory (For instance the authors mentioned that he/she used SPSS to analyse data. This is wrong. SPSS is a tool that helps the analyse data but the author needs to mention the techniques used for data analysis). Re-work on the methodology part. 6. Summary of the findings are not well presented. The author is required to summarise the findings obtained. No need to mentions numbers of respondents who agreed/disagreed with the statement provided. 7. Recommendation (s) is missing**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Empirical Literature section missing**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript does not sound scientifically, since it didn't provide a comprehensive review of the existing literature by identifying the gaps that the research aims to fill and situating the study within the broader academic discussion.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**References are sufficient**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The manuscript needs a proofreader since it has a number of typos and grammatical errors**	
Optional/General comments	**The manuscript is publishable and has original contribution to the body of knowledge**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Blandina Kisawike**
Department, University & Country	**University of Iringa, Tanzania**