



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_10962
Title of the Manuscript:	Handwritten to Electronic Prescriptions: Emerging Views and Practices, Saudi Arabia
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Search strategies in the abstract and manuscript body are different (see search terms) - The paragraph "scope of the review" should be moved after the introduction - Create a "results" section after the methodology - The flow chart of selected studies has to be explained in the results section of the manuscript, not in "search method" - Standarts and principles, advantages and disadvantages of EP - these sections are not very consistent with the scope of the review. I suggest that you shorten them and move the information in the introduction. - Table 1 - specify source of listed definitions 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer