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Reviewer's report:

Learning to prescribe -- pharmacists' experiences of supplementary prescribing training

Minor essential revisions

1. Throughout the paper the authors use the terms ‘multi-disciplinary’, ‘interprofessional’ and ‘inter-disciplinary’ apparently interchangeably. These mean different things, which is not always explicitly clear in the way the terms have been used in the paper. There needs to be consistency in how the terms are used, and definitions provided as to what they mean in this context.

2. Page 8 -- the authors should state that "only a minority of pharmacists had *completed* independent prescribing training" -- many more had started it and thus the word "undertaken" is confusing.

3. Page 9 -- the authors should provide numbers as well as percentages for the data on attitudinal questions. The same applies to the data presented in figure 1.

4. Page 10 -- it is unclear what the authors mean by pharmacists valuing insight into what prescribing "would be like (in terms of shadowing a doctor)" -- did they value learning about this or doing this?

5. Page 13 -- there needs to be a definition provided for the abbreviation PG Dip

6. Page 15 -- is the use of Approved Prior Learning possible under the current requirements for supplementary prescribing courses? This is not clear. The authors should explain what they mean by the comment that "the trend towards increasing multidisciplinary training may conflict with this".

8. Page 17 -- the sentence beginning "other issues relating to doctors are that they..." suggests that this statement comes from the data, when it does not (or at least not from the data that are presented in the paper).

9. Page 18 -- Reference 20 is not about integrating either supplementary or independent prescribing training into the pharmacy undergraduate curriculum, as is implied here. This paper is about teaching undergraduate students the principles of appropriate prescribing.

10. The limitations of the questionnaire format are explained well, but I do not feel that it is the issue that it "did not allow pharmacists to describe" so much as the pharmacists *chose not to describe*, despite being given sufficient space.

Discretionary revisions

11. More of a stylistic comment, but I disliked the way that the authors enumerated the points at the beginning of each paragraph ("secondly", "a third issue", "a fourth point" etc).

12. I would also have preferred to see the limitations stated much earlier in the discussion, so that the authors' comments can be placed into the context of those limitations.

13. The authors could make it clear that the term "pharmacology" refers to clinical pharmacology, rather than basic pharmacology.
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