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Review report
Title: “Scale development on consumer behavior toward counterfeit drugs in a developing country: A quantitative study exploiting the tools of an evolving paradigm”

I think that the article has benefited so much from previous reviewers’ comments and suggestions and no major changes would be required so on. Nevertheless, still more improvement could be sought and achieved via additional rounds of rigorous peer review. In the following, I am going to raise few points.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. It is mentioned in page 5 that “If public health policymakers or marketing managers wish to measure the extent to which an individual in the developing world has a high or low tendency to acquire counterfeit drugs…”. Is the tendency that is supposed to be measured an individuals’ tendency or a community tendency? I think that the word “individual” should be replaced by “community” or “consumers”.

2. It is mentioned in page 8 that “As the study progressed, data collectors changed to more purposive approach to sampling. This meant that it is possible to ask at the participant selection level for more participants with a particular characteristic”. Is that what is called “snowball” sampling procedure? If this description is applicable to your sampling procedure, please use it to be more specific.

3. It is mentioned in page 11 that “The authors are primarily concerned about prediction determining the minimum number of factors needed to account for the maximum portion of the variance represented to in the original set of variables”. I think that this sentence is not clear and it needs re-phrasing.

4. You responded to the first inquiry in my previous review report which said “how can we practically use your scale to measure consumers’ behavior towards counterfeit medications?” by saying “scoring was added at the end of the questionnaire. Some readers may not go to the questionnaire. It could be fine if you add just short notes about this at the end of the discussion.

5. You responded to my fourth query about affordability, availability and accessibility-related perceptions by saying changes were applied as proposed.
That was fine. Please, just apply the same thing in table 3.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Is your developed instrument applicable only to developing countries (i.e. cannot be used for a developed country)? From the article it looks that you assume not. But what prevent it from being a tool that measures consumers’ tendency towards counterfeit drugs everywhere. The main factors playing roles in consumers’ behaviors could be the same everywhere (i.e. universal) because people generally behave in a similar or at least a comparable way, however, some cultural or country-related factors such as accessibility may moderate some relationships between main variables.
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