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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This paper investigates attitudes for reporting of adverse drug reaction among health care professionals at 4 Pharmacovigilance Centres (RPC) in Nepal. The study is well written and the result is presented in a good way and relevant methods are used for the analysis. A supplement with the questionnaire is attached.

I have some major comments:

Methods:
Study design and settings
1. Was the questionnaire distributed to all health care professionals at the 4 RPC?

Results:
Table 1
2. Of the responders 9 were under than 20 years of age, how is it possible to be an educated nurse, pharmacist or doctor at that age?

Is the age distribution representative for the target group?

Discussion
Page 6
While looking at experiences and ages of the respondents, mostly the young and beginner healthcare professionals were participated in this research.
See above, can you comment on why it was mainly young participants.

Page 7, last paragraph:
But in the countries where ADR monitoring system is well established for example UK, France, Netherland and Sweden the ADR reporting rates among physicians estimate 40-70% [6, 7, 8, 16, 20].

3. Reporting rate can be defined in different ways, can you please expand the term in this context.
The main reason for not reported ADR cases in this study were healthcare professionals did not know about existence of pharmacovigilance centre/unit in their hospitals.

4. Is that a result from your study?

Minor revisions

Background

Page 3, last paragraph

5. You stated that the current reporting trends suggests high under reporting Do you have any information on the reporting rate in Nepal, for example number of reports/million inhabitants?

The findings of knowledge about ADR and ADR reporting among healthcare professionals will be presented elsewhere.

6. It would have been very interesting to incorporate the result of knowledge in the study

Methods:

Data collection, page 5

7. How did you do the target follow up

Result:

8. It would have been very interesting to have the attitudes divided in the different categories of heath care professionals. The question is whether there were any differences between doctors, pharmacists and nurses?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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