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Reviewer's report:

The paper has very much improved. After going through the very few comments the article is ready for publication.

Minor essential revision:
Page 5: in the beginning:
...... information, with a view to improving understanding of the risks
Should be...... information, with a view to improve understanding of the risks..

Page 7:
We described the context of use of new drug, the type of novelty of new drug, and elements influencing the impact (e.g. efficacy, safety, ease of use) of new manufactured product with respect to.....

Add an article: ..... We described the context of use of a new drug, the type of novelty of a new drug, and elements influencing the impact (e.g. efficacy, safety, ease of use) of a new manufactured product with respect to.....

Page 8:
You mention Figure 2 here. But it is the first figure you mention in the text. You should see over the numeration of all figures (maybe mention the other figures earlier) so that the numbers are correct.

Page 15:
We felt that it was useful to show the daily cost of the drug.

Change to: Daily costs of the drug are presented if available. (or anything else but not “we felt”)

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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