Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medicine and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMAH_86012**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Administration of High-Risk Medication: A Hospital Based Study**
Type of the Article	**Original**

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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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	**I appreciate the opportunity to evaluate a manuscript with such a relevant topic.** **I suggest not using acronyms in the abstract. I suggest reviewing all acronyms used in the text and putting their meaning in their first appearance.** **I suggest structuring the text in the format of a scientific article. Using and detailing the topics Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion.** **The introduction is not organized according to the recommended scientific standard. I suggest removing methods data from this section. I suggest revising the whole introduction. Bring citations of studies and raise data on the epidemiological situation of errors involving high-risk medications and the issue of patient safety.** **I suggest putting a list at the bottom of the tables with the meaning of acronyms.** **In the methods, I suggest more detail on the collection of the variables studied. The reader should be able to read the methods and replicate the study done elsewhere. Therefore, the methodology should be very detailed and clear.** **In the results, I suggest bringing more data from the instruments and interviews used with the nursing professionals. It was not clear how their knowledge about high-risk medications was evaluated.** **Finally, I suggest reviewing the number of tables. It would be more interesting to reduce the number and have a more general table.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Marcus Fernando da Silva Praxedes**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Federal do Recôncavo da Bahia, Brazil**