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Dear Dr Alessandra Buja,

RE: MS 6626850634971613

We would like to thank you for considering our manuscript: “Public health in community pharmacy: A systematic review of pharmacist and consumer views” for publication in BMC Public Health. We thank the editor and reviewer for their valuable comments on our submission. We have made substantial changes to the search terms which we feel have addressed the main issues raised by the reviewer.

As requested we have provided point by point responses to the concerns raised by the reviewers. Furthermore, all changes made in the document are highlighted and can be viewed in the “final showing markup” view. We believe that the revised paper is significantly improved, and hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication by BMC Public Health. We look forward to hearing back from you in due course.

Yours Sincerely,

Claire Eades
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response/Changes Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes well described and appropriate however not sure all the published papers have been incorporated as search terms are narrow. For example, the authors have referred to some papers on emergency contraception but have not included a number of our studies and a more recent systematic review from Human reproduction.</td>
<td>In light of these comments, the authors have widened the search terms in an attempt to identify and incorporate the missed literature. The first two parts of the search term (covering population and outcomes of interest) have been kept the same and additional terms have now been added to the third section (covering the areas of public health). On revision of the search terms initially used, it is clear that the single search term used to cover the sexual health services (“sexual health”) was not sufficient so two additional terms have been included (chlamydia testing, emergency contraception”). It became apparent that the terms used for some other areas of public health were also too narrow and a further 6 terms have been added (weight, health education, alcohol, needle exchange, methadone, injecting equipment). The updated combination of search terms can be found on page 6 of the manuscript. The search was re-executed with first two parts of the search term and only the new terms outlined above for the third section. This search resulted in 701 additional abstracts, 29 full texts assessed and an additional 20 papers included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? I am not sure if they are ignoring qualitative studies and just focussing on cross sectional surveys.</td>
<td>The inclusion criteria for the review covered both qualitative and quantitative papers and these criteria were adhered to when assessing papers. We have now made this explicit in the manuscript (page 6, half way down page) The relatively small number of papers conducted on this topic using qualitative methodologies may have resulted in the perception that these studies were being ignored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Are the data sound?

See above and it is unfortunate that the authors have not referred to the more recent systematic reviews that were done to inform the DH and are available on PharmacyHealthLink website under research.

As suggested these reviews have now been included in the introduction and discussion of the review (see pages 4, 23 and 25)

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

The limitations of the work are stated. However the focus is on response rates when a few of the studies are qualitative in nature. Also in my mind the review is incomplete as the search terms have failed to capture all of the studies that have been completed in this period. Need to state that just focussed on cross sectional surveys if this is the case.

See response to comment 1 regarding the search terms and focus on cross sectional surveys.

A section on the limitations of the qualitative studies has now been included in the results section (under subtitle “Quality of included studies” page 8) and in table 1 under the quality issues heading (changes highlighted in red).

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Not enough see above

See response to comment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The authors could try to perform a stratification analysis of the studies by some variables that can explain the difference in attitude and perception of the role of pharmacists in public health fields. For example considering the difference in health system of countries where the studies were published or epidemiological diffusion in behavioural and life styles risk factors or in diseases (e.g. prevalence of AIDS) in the countries. Perhaps some the difference and variability in the opinion could be explained by these underline conditions. The authors can add one or two tables with some synthesises of the results to provide an easier reading of whole paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>