



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

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>

**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 <b>estimate the monthly rate of NMs</b> during the year 2012 in KSMC, Riyadh, and <b>compare factors influencing NMs</b> 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 <b>is larger as it explores the rate and determinants of NMs over a period of one year ....</b></p> <p>And in row 78-79: We examine here <b>the role of real world practice factors that could have affected NMs</b> 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 <b>OPPOSITE</b> 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: <b>to be considered by the editor to make appropriate decision.</b></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><b>Finally, please:</b></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>	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**