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Reviewer's report:

The article by Gyawali et al has been improved but more revisions are required before it can be accepted for publication. I have noted that some of the responses in the letter are nowhere to be seen in the main manuscript.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? NO (see specific comments below)

3. Are the data sound? Somehow

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? NO especially for qualitative data

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes but can be improved

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes but can be improved

9. Is the writing acceptable? NO, there are many grammatical errors and the quality of English is not yet good.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Major compulsory revisions

Data analysis section especially for qualitative data is still missing in the main manuscript. Answers which were provided in the letter are not only contradicting each other but also not sufficient. They wrote on page 2 of the letter that “The qualitative data was processed and analysed manually. The researchers transcribed the data.” They went on to write in page 3 of the response letter that “the interview was tape recorded and transcribed manually”. On page 2 again of the response letter they also wrote “The point which came during the interview were noted in additional paper”.
Authors should spend more time in this part and make it clear how many interviews were carried out, who conducted the interviews, how long they lasted, was there data saturation? were they tape recorded/digitally recorded? who coded the data and how the analysis was carried out. Which methodological approach did they use to analyse the data? Again I advice them to refer to the COREQ or RATS checklists for reporting qualitative data.

Minor essential revisions

Abstract

Background: the 1st sentence does not read well

4th line: Replace “aimed” with “aims”

Materials and methods:

Results: 1st line, add the word “pharmacy” in between fifty four and in-charges

The 2nd sentence should read “ About half of the studied premises were operated by legally recognized pharmaceutical personnals (pharmacists, assistant pharmacists and professionals) and the remaining were run by people who do not have the legal authority to operate pharmacies independently.”

The 3rd sentence should read: “About a quarter of pharmacies were providing services such as administration of injections, wound dressing, and laboratory and consultation services in addition to medicine dispensing and counselling services.”

The last sentence of page 2 is not very clear. The authors should use whole numbers without decimals and revise the sentence. For example “28.78 patients obtained medicines without prescription”-this sentence is vague and does not convey any meaning, is it a percentage? If yes then it contradicts the first sentence on page 3 which reads “Most patients visiting the pharmacies were dispensed with medicines without prescriptions”.

Page 3, 2nd line I think the authors want to say commonly administered injections and not used. The 2nd sentence on page 3 needs some improvement: clarify if the wastes were disposed in municipal waste bins, is it “without taking proper precautions” or “adhering to proper procedures for disposing hazardous waste”?

Conclusions: 3rd line-replace “might have” with “may” and “rendered” with “offered”. 5th line- replace “upgrade pharmacy” with “the”. 6th line-add “good” before pharmacy practice. Delete “…and counselling, administration of injections and waste disposal” since counselling is part of pharmacy practice and it is not known whether administration of injection in the pharmacy is legal or not.

Introduction

The 1st sentence can be improved to read “ Community pharmacy is a unique combination of service and business in which pharmaceuticals are sold (business) and information about medicines use and prevention and treatment of
diseases (services) are given.
4th line-Add “in most cases” between “are and “the first point…”’. Replace “for their” with “seeking”
6th line-add “hence” improve the overall….“their communities” (use plural)
8th line at the end of the paragraph add “purposes” after “consultation”
2nd paragraph: 4th line is it Nepali language or Nepalese language?
5th line should read:…… (DDA) which is the governments body dealing with medicines and the related affairs.
Page 5, last paragraph, 1st sentence should start with plural “Injections are”…then add “their use are” before the word popular.
Page 6, 1st para 2nd sentence instead of injection equipment may be should be injection needles.
2nd para, 2nd-3rd line-what is the therapeutic injection equipment?
3rd line-Injection equipment again does not read well.
Page 8: Study design and procedure
I don’t agree with the authors if the sampling method they described it in the letter is random sampling. Looks more like a purposive sampling.
Sample size, page 9. Again the justification of sample size is not convincing. The authors should put the answer they put to the response letter in the manuscript rather than what they have written. That “The total number of premises which met our inclusion criteria were 275 out of the 350 pharmacies in the city. We chose 54 premises only, three from each of the 18 wards for the study because …(they need to justify this whether it was due to resource and time constraints or any other reasons)
Page 9, ethical issues-This is usually placed at the end of the methods section. Usually we begin the section by the ethical approval then issues related to consents come next.
Page 9 on data collection tools and technique: Even though the authors have describe the three tools/methods they should use sub-titles for each tool.
2nd line: the authors should just write “ part one collected demographic information”
4th line- I am not sure whether “used injection equipment” is a proper word. What about used cotton wools, gauzes etc since these premises were also offering wound dressing services.
Line 9: Is it the final results or in the analysis?
Line 10-11: Information about interviews should be on the next paragraph
About the Interviews on page 10, the authors have described the guide quite well but again they wrote in the response letter about how long each interview lasted, documentation etc but not in the manuscript as well. Authors should make sure
that their responses in the response letter are as well found in the main manuscript.

Page 10 line 1: Replace the word “researcher” by “Interviewee”

Page 10, 2nd paragraph: I think “Inspection” is a better word than “Observation”.

Page 10, last three lines at the bottom about the time of data collection and absence of in-charges are not in appropriate place. Note this paragraph was describing observation.

Also the next sentence “As for statistical analysis…. Should be placed under a section dealing with data analysis

Authors should add a sub-section about data analysis

Results

Page 12-13, 1st line-the authors should write “on average each premise had 2 working staffs but in some cases we found one or up to five”. Note: The number of people cannot have decimals (must be whole numbers). I am not quite sure whether giving the range is appropriate.
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