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We are providing a revised copy of the manuscript, Clinical decision support tools: analysis of online drug information databases (MS 1777467325120759), which has integrated the final requests of the reviewers. We are also including a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments.

Additionally, to address the editors’ points:

The references have been modified from superscript to bracket format and the rest of the formatting has been re-examined. Regarding the results that were available online, that was just the text of a poster abstract that had been presented at a meeting. We do not anticipate any type of copyright issue, MEDNET makes all of their poster and panel abstracts available online prior to the meeting. The point regarding the timeline was that the initial poster results were ‘publicly available’ prior to the receipt of any funding, which should help assuage concerns about competing interests.

We look forward to the publication of the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Kevin A. Clauson, Pharm.D.
Referee 1 (JCD)

We deleted the term ‘standalone’ as a qualifier of Category 1 comprehensive online drug databases at the suggestion of the reviewer so as to avoid any confusion it might create.

The recommended language for the conclusion (in both the text and abstract) has been adopted to reflect the reviewer’s preference.

The authors wish to again thank JCD for his time and efforts in improving this manuscript.

Referee 2 (PT)

General
While we appreciate PT’s perspective, it does appear that we continue to disagree on some of the finer points. We stand by our previous assertions about the databases and particularly the content of these databases (which is what we evaluated) being used as part of and integrated into formal clinical decision support systems. We agree with PT that we did not assess their impact on decision making and ultimately outcomes, but that was not what this phase of the study was designed to do, nor did we claim that in the manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions
We believe the level of depth regarding the questions in the text is sufficient and have received no other negative input about it. However, if PT/the editors would like additional detail, the information provided in the previous point-by-point response could be incorporated into the text to address this.

Regarding providing information on the frequency of updates – the intent was to point out these results were a snapshot in time. The actual frequency of database content modification varies from weekly scheduled updates to non-scheduled content-driven updates with the caveat that if a sentinel event occurs, a black box warning is implemented or a drug is pulled from the market, that off-schedule updates may be fast-tracked.

The authors thank PT for his input.

Referee 3 (WS)

The authors wish to thank WS for her review of the revisions and for her original recommendations which we believe improved the final product.