



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_8607
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparative Analysis of Electronic Prescribing Near Misses in King Saud Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Authors should clarify the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why do you divide the year into 2 parts?</li> <li>• How do you choose the periods?</li> <li>• You mention some factors that can explain the differences between the two periods, but there is need of more structured and in depth discussion</li> <li>• Your discussion section is very good but I suggest that authors try to focus on several vital points concerning their study. Now the reader gets a little lost.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well written and discusses an important topic in healthcare and patient safety. I find it suitable for publication after some changes (as marked above).	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hristina Viktorova Lebanova</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Faculty of Pharmacy, Medical University-Sofia, Bulgaria</b>