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Reviewer’s report:

1. Major revision- were the TGA, EMA and FDA warnings the ONLY ones that prescribers may have received?. It seems unlikely that the companies sent warnings independently of the regulatory agencies but all sources of warnings need to be considered before attributing causality to any one(s).

This is a particularly important issue where action has been taken by prescribers in Australia well ahead of any warning from the TGA. This obviously begs the question of defining those influences and this would need a separate qualitative study but it should be possible to identify any direct action by the industry.

2. Minor revisions.

Background para4. Suggest last sentence to become "....the PBS restricted prescription of rosiglitazone by requiring prior telephone approval "

Discussion para3, penultimate sentence-- is there evidence to support the word "unsubstantially" as applied to Australian access to safety warnings?. If not delete this word.

3. Overall - well written but at times a bit repetitive -- could be reduced in size especially the Background section.

4. This is the only formal assessment of changes in use of the two glitazones in Australia of which I am aware and contributes to the drug utilisation literature even though the trends identified unsurprisingly reflect those reported in Europe and the USA. The question of where Australian prescribers are getting their primary information about drug warnings warrants further work.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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