



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | 2013_BJPR_8607 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Comparative Analysis of Electronic Prescribing Near Misses in King Saud Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia |

PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any) | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|--|--|
| <p>- The author added some information concerning the number (and %) of reported NMs which contain more than one NM, and concerning missing values.</p> <p>- In response to our remarks as : Do multiple regression analysis to take into consideration the confusion factors / Estimate the trend by doing logistic regression , The author cannot do certain analysis that consider as " sophisticated analysis, and comments: "(sorry)""Trends are apparently significant between T1 and T2 and monthly NM varies throughout the year 2012" " Our study was not designed to estimate correlations or most powerful predictors of NM through conducting regression analysis or even see fluctuations in NM rates."</p> <p>But in OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE paragraph (row 43-49) the authors wrote:</p> <p>- This study seeks to estimate the monthly rate of NMs during the year 2012 in KSMC, Riyadh, and compare factors influencing NMs between the first and second [T1 and T2] six months of the year, building on our previous work [16].</p> <p>- The scope of this study is larger as it explores the rate and determinants of NMs over a period of one year</p> <p>And in row 78-79: We examine here the role of real world practice factors that could have affected NMs between the two arbitrary time periods.</p> <p>As reviewer, I want to do multiple regression analysis because it estimates the impact of two or more variables on the dependent variable (NM), may predict certain causal determinants, and in certain times we found that one variable really has the OPPOSITE of the effect that you estimate in bivariate analysis.</p> <p>- The authors wrote "We understand auto-plagiarism very well (we cited our ref.) and also feel that in a paper like this auto-plagiarism is rather very difficult to be avoided. Second paper is built on first paper"</p> <p>As the author, I understand certain auto-plagiarism, but there are a big auto-plagiarism: to be considered by the editor to make appropriate decision.</p> <p>- Finally, the authors wrote: If I am reviewer of this paper, can raise many more questions and more difficult questions that will add very little to this paper. "</p> <p>As reviewer, certain simple things as "p value between the total NM in T1, and T2", the statistics mentioned above, and reducing the auto-plagiarism may improve the validity and the reliability of the valuable data collected, data analysis, and the quality of this article.</p> <p>Finally, please:</p> <p>- Note in the discussion the limitations of this study: Our study was not designed to estimate correlations or most powerful predictors of NM through conducting regression analysis and we cannot predict causal relationship between NM and certain determinants; or even see fluctuations in NM rates.</p> <p>- auto-plagiarism: to be considered by the editor to make decision according to the policy of the journal</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unlike the reviewers 1 and 2, this reviewer lacks the understanding of this paper. None of them have suggested doing multiple regression analysis and logistic regression. 2. Wordings modified highlighted in green (new modifications) for avoiding semantic confusion. 3. Dependent variable – number of NMs ok. Independent variables in terms of real world practice factors, which have possibly affected the occurrence of NMs across two timelines, are in fact not measured in this study. In addition, other factors that may determine NMs occurrence are patients-, prescriber-, dispenser-, system- and settings-related factors and the details of each are not measured or collected again. Yet this reviewer suggests doing multiple regression and logistic regression analyses when independent variables are not systematically measured. She should understand this point. 4. We do not want to argue further because even the suggested terms multiple regression and logistic regression are contextually not correct. The appropriate words are nonparametric regression (data not normally distributed), simple (one covariate) and multiple (≥ 2covariate) linear regression (data normally distributed), simple (one covariate) logistic regression, and multiple (≥ 2covariate) logistic regression (dichotomous outcome). 5. This study is unique because it discusses real world practice factors (unlike real intervention (s) between two timelines) as the possible determinants affecting NMs occurrence across T1 and T2. That is the difference between the two studies of ours. Of course T2 data addition as well. 6. We have given exact p values as required by most journals in all tables included in this study. 7. We would like to inform that research on NMs is scanty worldwide but especially in Arab world. Such studies with some limitations need to be published. 8. Our results are preliminary in nature and therefore further researches on NM are needed especially to determine exactly what factors underlie NM occurrence. 9. We reemphasize that auto-plagiarism (AP) cannot be avoided in this paper despite our efforts to rephrasing sentences and text of our first paper. To avoid any infringement of copyright assignment, we can seek permission to use some contents of our first paper from Dove Press J publisher. OR if she can rephrase sentences through track changes in this paper to mitigate huge AP, we can accept wholeheartedly such changes. 10. We express our sincere thanks to all three reviewers but especially to this reviewer who made certain comments we did not agree with. However, we learned a lot from this exercise as learning is a continuous process. |