Reviewer’s report

Title: Knowledge, attitude and practice of antibiotic use among university students: A cross sectional study in UAE

Version: 0 Date: 20 Mar 2019

Reviewer: Gabriel Trueba

Reviewer's report:

The paper entitled "Knowledge, attitude and practice of antibiotic use among university students: A cross sectional study in UAE" is a comparison of knowledge, attitudes and practices of medical students and non-medical students. The paper is well written and even though there are papers with similar content, the information presented is relevant for the UAE. The methods seemed appropriate and the conclusions were justified.

Comments:

1) The conclusion section is too long because the authors describe the results of the surveys in detail. This should be done in the results section. The discussion should be focused in the main findings without repeating information of the result section.

2) Including the names of the authors of each investigation cited in the text (specially in introduction and conclusions) lengthens unnecessarily the manuscript and disrupts the reading flow. Use only the references' numbers.

3) The legends of tables and specially the figures need more information (describe what vertical and horizontal axes are). The tables and figures (with their legends) must be self-explanatory.

Minor points

1) Line 24, include a comma in 2500

2) Line 31, write: toward the cause…

3) Line 62, eliminate this redundant text: "for the sampling"
4) Line 69, eliminate this redundant text: "The questionnaire comprised four sections; demographic information, knowledge of antibiotics, attitude and practice towards antibiotic use".

5) Line 86, include a comma in 1200

6) Line 251, write "there is an abuse"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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