

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

**The article is interesting, but it does contain some inaccuracies. They concern:
title: should be a bit shorter, in its current form it is quite illegible.**

Dear reviewer, the title contains 10 words (85 characters with spaces). We consider that this title is legible and concise for readers. Thank you for your suggestion.

This is also related to the suggestion for keywords, which are too many and do not fully reflect the problem of the topic. In addition, these should be phrases, the most important keys that the reader can use to find the article in search engines. The authors are requested to correct these inaccuracies.

In this journal, the instructions for authors indicate that: “keywords are specific to the article, yet reasonably common within the subject discipline”. The keywords used in this study meet the criteria established by the journal.

Abstract:

There is no information in this part of the article about the control group and on which group the research was conducted. The authors should present the characteristics of the group / groups of respondents that have been analyzed for self-treatment. There is no specific summary of the overall research that is the subject of this article. Was it a survey? Please complete this.

This is a cross-sectional and descriptive study. There is no control group. The abstract indicates the following: “Online questionnaires were completed with sections on sociodemographic characteristics, use of medicines or medicinal plants and their treated symptoms, sources of collection, and their recommendation”.

The characteristics of the respondents are mentioned in section 2.1. This information is too long to show in the abstract section.

Introduction: It is quite short and laconic. It does not contain information that would introduce the reader to the meaning of the experiment performed with regard to relevant research regarding the scope of the topic.

In this journal, the instructions for authors indicate that: “The introduction should briefly place the study in a broad context and highlight why it is important”. The information presented in the introduction section meets this criterion.

The authors did not indicate the novelty of their experiment. What is the difference between the present research and the previously published data from other regions of the world. So please outline the background around the analyzed problem, especially.

The following information was added in the manuscript to indicate the novelty of the study: This is one of the first studies in Mexico that includes many respondents from all over the country.

The discussion section compares information of similar studies carried out in other countries and the present study.

Chapter: 2. Results and Discussion and 3. Discussion

Here you should separate these chapters so that they are separate, for example:

2. Results

3. Discussion

The sections were separated

Then chapter 5. Conclusions

The authors are asked to formulate specific 2-3 conclusions that emerge from this study.

Two specific conclusions are included in this manuscript:

- 1) There is a high prevalence of self-medication practice in children from Mexico, mainly associated with children with chronic diseases and families with three or more children.
- 2) It is necessary to promote national programs for rational use of medications to avoid self-medication in Mexican children.

The methodology is not clear, please give the group of respondents. It is not known on which group the research was conducted.

The methodology section was improved by adding the following information suggested by the reviewers 1 and 3:

The appropriate population size for this study was estimated using Raosoft software (Raosoft, Inc. free online software, Seattle, WA, USA). The population of children under 12 years of age in Mexico is 3.5 million in 2020 [31] and estimated that approximately 50% practice self-medication, the sample population was 1.75 million residents, the margin error was 1%, the confidence level was 95%, and the response distribution was 50%. A sample size of 9552 was necessary. Only those surveys that were completely compliant were included.

Self-medication was defined as the personal decision of the parents to administer, without consulting a physician, allopathic and/or complementary medicine to their children (12 years old and younger) in the last 6 months. The snowball sampling technique was used to distribute the questionnaire link [33], which includes sending the form link to the authors' contact lists and encouraging participants to share the link with their contacts. Also, the questionnaire link was then distributed on various social media platforms, including Facebook®, Facebook Messenger®, and WhatsApp Messenger®.

Multivariate logistic regression was performed to assess significant predictors of self-medication among the independent variables using the binary logistic regression test. Results were presented as adjusted odds ratios (AOR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). P values of ≤ 0.05 were considered statistically significant.