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Reviewer's report:

In the present manuscript, authors reported the results of an on-line survey that aimed to identify enablers and barriers to individually tailored prescribing into routine medical practice in healthcare professionals in the UK. Please, see below my comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript.

Title of study:

Suggestion: Enablers and barriers to individually tailored prescribing into routine medical practice in healthcare professionals in the UK: a cross-sectional mixed methods study

Abstract

Background: It is too long. Please, do a very short synthesis to highlight the relevance of our study (three to four short sentences maximum).

Methods: The following information was missing: study design and data analyses.

Suggestion for the methods:

We conducted a cross-sectional mixed methods study based an on-line survey informed by the Normalisation Process Theory (NPT) covering four domains of work: sense making, engagement, action and monitoring. The survey questions aimed to identify enablers and barriers to the implementation of FLIPMeds model in a convenience sample of health professionals.

Please, add one sentence on how the survey data analyses were performed.

Results: Please, report explicitly the main results enablers and barriers identified

Conclusion: Please, remove the last sentence.
Background

There were too details in the background. Please, make it more concise.

Methods

Study design: Please, specify your study design. The on-line survey is a way used to collect data of interest.

Sample: No comments

Data collection: Please, put the information about questionnaire development and variables of interest under the Data collection section. It should be relevant to present a figure showing the mechanism of NPT.

Statistical analysis: Authors seemed to have performed comparison analyses on quantitative data. Did they use statistical tests to do these comparisons? If yes, please, specify these tests in the Methods section. If no, please, clarify how the comparisons were performed.

Results

There is a mix of results and discussion in the Results section. Please, just report results (e.g., frequency, mean, statistical test results, qualitative analyse results) in the Results section, and report the interpretation and comparison of results with existing literature in the Discussion section. For example: In the Results section, authors reported that there were more women than men - partly reflecting the strong nursing representation, as well as known gender bias in survey response [54]. It would have been interesting that authors report the percentage of men or women in the Results section and explain their results in the Discussion section.

It would have been interesting to clearly distinguish enablers and barriers for each NPT domain of interest.

Table 1 should be restructured. It is difficult to interpret the reported percentages. Frequencies (number and percentages) and missing data were not correctly reported for all variables. Please, check the reported numbers in Table and make corrections when necessary.

Suggestion of a template to present your results in Table 1:

Table 1: xxx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nurse prescribers</th>
<th>General practitioners</th>
<th>Pharmacists</th>
<th>Other HP*</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=234(%)</td>
<td>N=97(%)</td>
<td>N=88(%)</td>
<td>N=25(%)?</td>
<td>N=444 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

Male

Female

Missing data

**Time in practice (in years)**

≤5

>5 and ≤15

>15

Missing data

**Location of participants**

England

Scotland

Ireland

Wales

Missing data

*Other HP= health professionals including physiotherapists (n=5), allied health professionals (n=5), non-prescribing nurses (n=4), secondary care doctors (n=4), managers (n=3), physician assistants (n=1), and non-known (n=XX?)

Please, refer all tables of results in the Results section.

**Discussion**

It was difficult to know what main results were discussed.
Please, start this section by a summary of your main findings distinguishing enablers and barriers identified. Each out of main findings should be separately explained and compared with the existing literature if possible.

I suggest to remove or rewrite the subsection entitled "implications for research and practice". Indeed, authors reported information about the refinement of FLIPMEDS description which was not the objective of present study.

Conclusion

Please, rewrite this section reporting relevant information that supports your data shown and perspectives for future research. Don't report bibliographic references in this section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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