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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your information that our manuscript entitled “Variability in market uptake of psychotropic medications in Europe reflects cultural diversity” is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Health Services Research. We now have revised the manuscript based on the final item raised by the reviewer; changes can be found in the new version. Please find below a detailed response to all (other) comments.

On behalf of all authors,

Joëlle Hoebert

Comments from the reviewers:

Reviewer #1

I accept the comprehensive responses to reviewers' comments.

End of reviewer comments

Reviewer #2
Kelly C. Lee (Reviewer 2): The authors have edited the manuscript addressing many of the comments recommended in the previous review. One major question remains as to the reasons for why the 3 medications were chosen. The authors cite that these are recently approved medications in the EU; however, it should be noted that these medications are used for significantly different indications and uses and the way in these medications are used for each disorder (schizophrenia/bipolar/major depression for aripiprazole, major depression for duloxetine and fibromyalgia/neuropathic pain for pregabalin) are quite distinct. The reasons for the market uptake variability can be due to varying reasons such as prevalence rates of affected disorders in the respective countries, knowledge/familiarity of these medications by prescribers, and other factors cited by the authors, warrant investigation. The conclusion statement should be revised to reflect that "lower regulation by means of strict norms may be a factor in explaining cross-national variation between these medicines."

Response:

We have selected the 3 medications on the common fact that they, despite being clinically relevant for some patients, are not seen as indisputable medical breakthroughs within their therapeutic areas. Therefore we expect that, within their therapeutic area, variation will exist as some patients will benefit more from these medications than other patients will. In addition, they are also high priced. Variation in use (and effectiveness) of these medications between patients or between prescribers, and on a higher level between regions and countries, is therefore likely to be influenced by different cultural approaches in the utilization of these medications. Nevertheless, we agree with the reviewer that market uptake variability can also be due to other reasons than cultural aspects, such as prevalence etc. In our discussion section, we already paid attention to this. In the concluding statement however, we mean to say that within the study of cultural dimensions, less regulation of social norms is a main factor in explaining cross-national variation between these medicines. We have modified the conclusion statement accordingly.

End of reviewer comments

Editor Comments:

1) Please update your Ethics statement to "Ethics and consent to participate".

Please include a statement on ethics approval AND consent.

If consent was not required, please state that this was not required for the study and provide a reason.

Response:

We have added a statement on consent to participate in the appropriate section.
2) Please move all Figure legends to after the References section. Figures should just be the images themselves.

Response:

We have done this accordingly.