

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Assessment of drug use pattern using WHO core drug use indicators in selected general hospitals: a cross-sectional study in Tigray region, Ethiopia
AUTHORS	tasew, segen; abraha, Haftom; gidey, kidu; Gebre, Abadi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Soleymani, Fatemeh Food and Drug Organization, MOH&ME, Food and Drug Laboratory Research Center & National Committee on Rational Drug Use
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jan-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well written with an important topic manuscript.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Opadeyi, Abimbola University of Benin, Department of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Jan-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This study describes drug utilization in the general hospital setting and this is useful as it would help the hospital systems develop better strategies to manage the deficiencies. However, I find that the dates of the study varies from methodology to results. It is also not clear if the assessment of the prescriptions was only a retrospective evaluation as the dates span from January 2017- June 2019, and then another March 1 2019 - August 30, 2019. These dates should be clarified.</p> <p>The results need to be better presented and the headings of the tables amended. Furthermore, the WHO reference values may be included in the tables but this should be appropriately referenced; Isah A, Laing R, Quick J, et al. The Development of Reference Values for the WHO Health Facility Core Prescribing Indicators. West Afr J Pharmacol Drug Res. 2001;18(1):6–11. doi: 10.4314/wajpdr.v18i1.14718 https://www.ajol.info/index.php/wajpdr/article/view/14718</p> <p>The discussion, limitations as well as the conclusion would need to be revised for grammar.</p> <p>Some of the references are incorrectly written and do not appear to conform to any particular style. These should be amended as well.</p> <p>Other comments are in the text.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer#1:

Response: Thank you!

Reviewer#2:

Response: This study was based on retrospective evaluation of randomly selected available prescriptions which were prescribed from January 2017 to June 2019. The prescriptions were assessed from March 1, 2019 to August 30, 2019 (study period). Further, 200 patients were interviewed, and the health facilities assessed on the above specified study period. We have now clearly described the information regarding the study period and population both in the abstract and methodology sections.

The tables for the resulted are formatted again with all the heading amended. In the WHO reference value, we have included the mentioned reference which stands at reference number “14” in the manuscript.

Response: The manuscript has been re-written, and its readability significantly improved. We have casted the grammar errors. Further, all the suggestions mentioned in the manuscript are now appropriately addressed.