

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81118
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-reporting of Medication administration errors among Nurses in Qatar
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Introduction. The introduction should be improved to provide sufficient background and include all relevant and up-to-date references. The research problem is important and current, but it should be presented in a clearer way</p> <p>The objective is not presented in an adequate way, which is what the researcher is trying to do. An objective with two verbs, better define the objective by unifying it.</p> <p>The study design is not clear: types of variables, the steps of the data collection procedure (Average time to complete the questionnaire) The characteristics of the hospitals (number of beds, use the same notification system, share data, previous training or courses in hospitals, posters, brochures ...).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Short study period or vacation. -Hospital characteristics, number of beds, nurse / patient ratio. -The study objective would be improved if its analysis and data collection were focused or complemented with a more qualitative methodology (ethnographic, phenomenological,) using an interview, since an email questionnaire is not very personal and protocol (despite being validated) to evaluate an emotion as primary as fear and in any case the first, second or third victims involved in medication administration errors. <p>Results. The text is not presented in a clear way, sometimes the same information is repeated in the text, figures, and tables.</p> <p>Discussion. Similar studies with which it is discussed are out of date. There is no differentiation between the facts (findings), the opinion of the author about the facts and finally that of other studies. Excess numbers, percentages, and statements. Lack of strengths or possible future research.</p> <p>Study limitation. Study limitations are not specified in detail: selection biases, information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Level of specialization or not of the nurses and different characteristics regarding the context, patient and medication in the wards. - The nurse / patient relationship or possible solutions to the limitations are not mentioned either. - It would be necessary to specify the type of error in the administration of medicines, the type of notification system (confidential, punitive, analysis by group of experts, classification of adverse events, incident or near-incident). <p>Ethical considerations. It would be necessary to mention the part of the informed consent (signature, identification number, photo ...).</p> <p>References: Update is recommended.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I want to congratulate the authors on the subject of the manuscript. In my opinion, I found the study very interesting, and I think the topic is very necessary. The manuscript is written in an understandable way and contains in each section the most relevant aspects of the research. However, the manuscript must make some important revisions.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francisco Miguel Escandell Rico
Department, University & Country	Alicante University, Spain