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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Denis Dupoiron (Reviewer 1): Very interesting study, well-built and well presented with a well-argued analysis

However few elements need to be improved:
1 - you use a lot of abbreviations without defining them

Eg: P6 L19: « CROM versus CROO »

Response: We have modified in the paper.

The introduction could be improved because it is not very explicit. it would be wise to highlight the interest of this study. Thus, explain the relative cost of each drug, and also compare the volumes of consumption of each of the molecules. So you provide arguments to justify this study

Response: Thanks for your comments, we have modified in the introduction part. While, there were insufficient data to debate on the cost of each drug and volumes of consumption of each of the molecules among all included studies, it would not be necessary to explain this in the introduction part, which would need more clinical trials to clarify this issue.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2):
REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The research methods are well explained with flow chart provided.

The authors have explained the reasoning behind their choice of methods.

Good statistical analysis methods have been applied.

Most of the abbreviations used in the manuscript have not been defined.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The authors need to define abbreviations, e.g., what is: API, WPI, MD, OR, PRR, CROM, CROO, HRs.

Response: We have modified in the paper.