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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Decision Letter

Dear editor,

Please find enclosed our second revised manuscript “Design and methods of the ‘Monitoring Outcomes of psychiatric Pharmacotherapy’ (MOPHAR) monitoring program – a study protocol” (manuscript BHSR-D-18-00522). Below please find our point-by-point rebuttal to the reviewers’ comments to our initially revised manuscript.

However, first we would like to express our gratitude to the reviewers and the Editorial Production Department for again their thoughtful and constructive comments which helped us to improve our manuscript. We have responded to each of the reviewers’ comments and hope we have properly addressed the issues raised in this second revised manuscript.
We hope this second revised version will be published in BMC Health Services Research.

The authors

Reviewer reports:
Samantha Hollingworth (Reviewer 1): The authors have successfully addressed my queries. Well done. Authors’ response: we thank this reviewer for her kind words on our revisions.

Fernanda Raphael Escobar Gimenes, PhD (Reviewer 2): The authors did a good job in reviewing this paper. Many of the recommendations made were accepted by the authors. There are a few points I would make:

Introduction & Background
Perhaps you could include a new item describing the MOPHAR Monitoring Program in this section (including the objectives of MOPHAR, target population, MOPHAR future researches, etc), instead of presenting it in the methods section. Then finalize this section with the general research objectives (as described in page 7, in the methods section).
Authors’ response: in the previous round of review and revisions, we revised the arrangement of the subheadings in response to comments from this reviewer (putting the research details before the monitoring program details). We still believe our paper gained in clarity as a study protocol from those revisions. Therefore, we suggest that we keep the arrangement of headings in this paper as it is.

Methods
Please, indicate the type of your study.
Authors’ response: We -in our opinion- already mentioned the type of study in the Methods section, under MOPHAR research on page 6, lines 20-25. In our revised manuscript, we mention the prospective and retrospective cohort studies together in the first sentence from this section: Methods, page 6 lines 21-22: ‘Apart from a somatic monitoring care path for routine clinical practice, the MOPHAR monitoring program also provides the opportunity for a long-term (longitudinal) prospective and retrospective observational cohort studies.’

You mention that future individual studies can be conducted using MOPHAR. For instance, in page 6, line 25, you affirm that "the MOPHAR monitoring program also provides the opportunity for a long-term (longitudinal) prospective observational cohort study", and in this same page, you affirm that "many questions may be answered in retrospective studies, including association studies and prediction models on the effect and side effects of psychotropic drugs". Perhaps this information could be presented in a new section describing the MOPHAR Monitoring Program (as suggested in the introduction section). Perhaps, in this section, you could focus only on the methods planned to answer the general research questions (as described in page 7).
Authors’ response: in the previous round of review and revisions, we put the research information (participants, outcomes, etc.) before the details on the MOPHAR monitoring program in response to a request from this reviewer (the opposite of the current comment). As stated before, we still believe our paper gained in clarity as a study protocol from those revisions. We are willing to rearrange (and rename) these subheadings, but we think that this won’t further improve the clarity of the paper. Therefore, we suggest that we keep the arrangement of headings in this paper as it is, but we ask the editor to make a final decision on this matter.
We – to our opinion – already focus on only the general methods of the MOPHAR program and research, leaving out details for specific research questions. Should the editor have additional requests on the abovementioned matters, we are happy to hear them.

Data Management and Statistical Analysis Please, indicate the statistical analysis you plan to do to answer the general research questions proposed for this study. Authors’ response: the subheading the reviewer is referring to is not mentioned in our manuscript. As with the more specific research questions that will be formulated per individual study within MOPHAR, the specific statistical analysis plans will also be described per individual study. We expect to use for example regression analysis techniques and longitudinal data analysis techniques (for clustered data), including mixed effects models. We added this information to our revised manuscript: Methods section, MOPHAR research, page 7, line 23 and on: ‘In addition, the statistical analyses plans will be described per individual research question. We expect to use for example regression analysis techniques and longitudinal data analysis techniques (for clustered data), including mixed effects models.’