

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78752
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use of Fluorometholone Eye Drops in a Public Healthcare Organization in Riyadh Province
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:

<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since there is no description about the data collection period, it is necessary to specify whether it is for one year or multiple years. 2. The authors stated that "Fluorometholone eye drops was uncommonly prescribed", but I don't know if it's really uncommonly because I don't know the population parameter. I think it is necessary to show the population in order to claim uncommonly. 3. I think it depends on the country or region, but did you not look up the diagnosis name for which fluorometholone was prescribed? If the diagnosis name could not be found, please state the reason as a limitation. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors described it as "This could be due to the availability of many topical anti-inflammatory agents". Specifically, what kind of drug was used or was it prescribed? I think it's better to include it in the discussion section. 2. Table 2 shows the results that the prescription amount was high in March, April and May. If there is a peculiar background to the increase in prescription amount during this period, it is desirable to describe it in the discussion. 	
Optional/General comments	A fact-finding survey to ensure that the drug is properly prescribed is important and interesting. However, since this manuscript does not specify the numerical values to be compared or information on alternative therapies, it cannot be determined whether the written contents are correct. I think that the manuscript will be better by reviewing the numerical values and the description method.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tetsuo Kume
Department, University & Country	Shizuoka Cancer Center, Japan