



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_28922
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Evaluation of Drug Safety in Emergency Process Using Modified HFMEA-based Associated Matrix
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 (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	This is an interesting paper. However, I have few comments as follows: 1. Lines 25-26: Why compare number of deaths of medication errors with car accidents? I don't see the association between them. 2. Lines 34-35: Please provide a reference. 3. Line 37-38: I think the phrase "four mores" and "three less" is a little confusing to describe the factors. Could you please restructure the sentence as "factors more frequently associated with..." and "factors less frequently associated with...". 4. Could you please briefly mention the prevalence of medication errors in the first paragraph? It is important to know the burden of the problem globally and in your country as an overview. 5. Could you please briefly describe on the gaps of previous literatures on their measurements of medication errors and what does this study adds, that could convince to overcome the gaps of previous measurements of medication errors. 6. Line 62: "The HFMEA is significantly time consuming". This should be added into the limitations of the study.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. In the methods part, it is important to state where the study location is, what are the inclusion and exclusion criteria, how were data included? 8. An ethics statement is a must. 9. Beginning Lines 76, please add a sub-topic “Procedure” that described how the study process will be carried out. 10. Data analysis: could you please clarify if the data was analysed manually or using a software? If yes, what software was used? 11. Lines 157 onwards: Please separate this part as the “Results”. 12. The suggestions for “failure causes”: Was it verified using an analysis? You may not include such suggestions in the results part if there were no analysis performed to validate it. Instead, you may include them in the “Recommendations” part at the end of the discussion. 13. The discussion needs further improvement. It is too summarized and needs to be an elaboration of the study findings, comparisons with previous literatures backed up with evidence. Probably the authors may compare other forms of models, and does this model overcome the weakness of previous models. Recommendations and limitations need to be described as well.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript requires some English language check. Some terms and phrases are confusing. Please have a language editing service or you may acknowledge anyone who helped in improving the flow of the language in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kurubaran Ganasegeran
Department, University & Country	Clinical Research Center, Seberang Jaya Hospital, Penang, Malaysia