



SDI Review Form 1.6

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
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The authors tried to explain some of the differences between the two groups under "Results". This is better done under "Discussion"	
Optional/General comments	Well written manuscript. The concept is good and the technical delivery is commendable.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph O. Fadare
Department, University & Country	Department of Pharmacology, College of Medicine, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria