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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor
Thank you for the opportunity to further review our paper. We have addressed the reviewer and editor’s comments and responded as follows:

Referee 2:
The abstract need to have a properly formulated aim not just say - to address gaps
Response:
Aims have been added

Editor’s comments:

"The methods is written too much as for the whole evaluation rather than the interviews specifically which this paper reports" Thank you for the making the changes you did, which have improved the paper. There are still some areas that are conflicting, probably because they relate to the main study. For example, thematic analysis is described as "involved three stages of open, axial and selective coding, which allowed key themes to emerge." This is a description of grounded theory analysis, which may have been appropriate for the main study (and may, indeed, have been used), but the results presented here have resulted from just simple, qualitative descriptive analysis, as no theory has been explicated. This would need to be clarified.
Response:
This has now been re-written to accurately reflect the content of the paper

"Referencing should not generally appear in a results section" I agree that you can put references in the results section if you wish, as results can be amalgamated with discussion in qualitative work. However, there is then little or
no discussion, that I can see, in this paper. Your results need to be placed in context of the world literature, so if you choose to combine results and discussion, you will need to compare findings in each sub-section with results of other research in that area. ‘WE Response:
We appreciate this insight, particularly regarding the limited discussion in the paper. We have therefore restructured the paper and provide a separate discussion section which situateds our findings in the national and international literature.

"The authors have not identified any limitations to their study". Please include a short section on limitations noted.
Response:
A limitations section has been added.

There is still no clearly-worded aim for this paper, and there needs to be one in both the abstract and the main text. "The aim of this paper is to address these gaps in knowledge" is not a true aim. Something like "To explore the views of pharmacy nurses and GPs of.." is more suitable.
Response:
The aims of the paper have been included

Some minor typos: ALL HAVE BEEN CORRECTED IN TEXT

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style \\nResponse:
Reformatted to conform to the style required

Handling Editor:
Minor typos - ALL HAVE BEEN CORRECTED

References –
It is not BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth style to give just one author plus ‘et al.’
Response
Apologies, we are not sure how this happened. References have been updated to adhere to the journal requirements
Reference 26 has typo 6th Edition2006, -
Response
Not sure if this is a type as we do not have 26 references!
We think it referred to reference 23 and have corrected this.

Thank you again for your support and I hope this is now acceptable to your journal.
Kind regards
Sue Kruske on behalf of the authors