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Dear editor,

Thank you for your kind response regarding our manuscript titled “National Essential Medicines List and Policy Practice: A Case study of China’s Health Care Reform”. I appreciate the suggestions from you and reviewers and had made the corresponding corrections and changes.

Editor’s comments:

Please address his comment by more clearly distinguishing which of your conclusions and recommendations directly follow from your data and which do not.

I have adjusted the structure in the discussion section. I detached the conclusions and recommendations follow from your data and which do not. Main problems of essential medicines list and the actual function of the provincial lists of supplemented medicines are the directly conclusions follow from the research results. While the recommendations on usage policy of essential medicines are not followed the results of the research, but it is necessary. Meanwhile, I have removed statement which didn’t directly follow from the research data in conclusion section.

2. After reading through your manuscript, we feel that the quality of written English needs to be improved before the manuscript can be considered further.

I have improved the quality of written English and got some language corrections.

Reviewer 1

1. The main premise of the concerns hold: the conclusions do not follow from the research. The best conclusions that one could come to is that the supplemental EML has not been selected based on evidence OR according to the guidelines for selection. Even if I might agree with some of the conclusions, the methodology offers no opportunity to extrapolate any further conclusion then that. The points raised by the authors are interesting but is merely discussion. Perhaps the language needs to be amended (including in the abstract) to highlight various options, and to clarify as a discussion. The conclusion or recommendations, however, ought to be amended.

In the original manuscript “Main problems of essential medicines list” and “Cause of the problem of provincial lists of supplemented medicines and its impact on essential medicines
system”, are the direct conclusion of the outcome of the research. Among the three suggestions in the "Advice for solving the problem" part in the original manuscript, "Revise National Essential Medicines List” was the direct suggestion based on the outcome of the research, “Eliminate the provincial supplementing policy” was the already existed content in the related policy in China Essential Medicine System, the reasons and necessity of which was discussed according to practice results in this research. “Change the usage policy of essential medicines” was merely discussion not direct suggestion based on the outcome of the research.

I have adjusted the structure in the discussion section. I merged the “Cause of the problem of provincial lists of supplemented medicines and its impact on essential medicines system” and the two suggestions of “Eliminate the provincial supplementing policy” and “Revise National Essential Medicines List” in the original manuscript to one part titled as “The function of the provincial lists of supplemented medicines and its actual effect”, as direct conclusion and suggestions draw from the research results. And separated "Change the usage policy of essential medicines" from not direct conclusion and suggestions draw from the research results as a independent part of discussion section.

Meanwhile, I have removed statement which didn’t directly follow from the research data in conclusion and abstract section.

After adjustment, the structures of the discussion section and conclusion section are more clear, “main problems of essential medicines list” and “the actual function of the provincial lists of supplemented medicines” are the directly conclusions follow from the research results. While, the points in usage of essential medicines have put in last subhead in discussion section and I explain that are not followed the results of the research directly, but necessary to discussion.

I have improved the quality of written English (including in the abstract) and got some language corrections.

Please let me know if these changes address your and other reviewers’ concerns. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Yours