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Reviewer’s report:

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 which 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."

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