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Author’s response to reviews:

Answers to the Reviewers’ Comments

Thank you very much for the valuable comments. We accepted all the remarks and tried to modify the manuscript accordingly. The changes are marked with yellow in "Corrected manuscript_highlighted.docx".

Reviewer #1:

1. There are some minor issues with the language of the manuscript. (e.g., „data was"; starting sentences with numerals)
   a. Line 76: a wider -> wider
   b. Line 84: data was -> data were
   c. Table 1: Other city -> Other cities
   d. Line 128: differences and relationship -> differences and correlations
   e. Line 138: data was -> data were
   f. Line 139: data was -> data were
   g. Line 141: study was -> study were
h. Line 149: this 540 patients -> these 540 patients
i. Line 201: in ACE-NSAID group -> in the ACE-NSAID group
j. Line 257: accordance with national regulations -> accordance with the national regulations
k. Line 258: data was -> data were
l. Line 258: data was -> data were
m. Line 260: study was -> study were

2. In Table 1 „SD" is missing from legends.
   a. Line 112: Data for patients and pharmacists involved in the study -> Data for patients and pharmacists involved in the study (SD=standard deviation)
   b. Table 1/Column 1: Mean (year) -> Mean ± SD (year)
   c. Table 1/Column 3: MEAN -> MEAN ± SD
   d. Table 1/Column 5: „MEAN ± SD”

3. The sum of percentages in Table 1 is close to 100%, but not exactly. (rounding minor issues)
   a. Table 1/Column 5: Other: 15,3% -> 15,2%
   b. Table 1/Column 5: Other cities: 35,7% -> 35,8%

4. Issues with statistical terminology: two-sample t-test (not probe); there is no correlation t probe (Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC))
   a. Line: 127: two sample t probe -> two sample t test
   b. Line 127: correlation t probes -> paired sample t test

5. What are the p-values for PCCs?
a. Line 128: “When calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient, the p value for the correlation coefficient is <0.005”

Reviewer #2:

Methods:

1. Line 86: Please confirm that all the participating pharmacists from all around the country went to Budapest and participated in a training at Semmelweis University.

   a. Line 88: “All the participating pharmacists from all around the country went to Budapest and participated in one-day training at Semmelweis University, which included the description and requirements of the project, and the presentation of the drug-related problem classification.”

2. Line 97: Authors mentioned that „All pharmacists had to have at least 10 patients." However in table 1. we learnt that 61 pharmacies with 606 patients participated: 9.9 patients/pharmacy. Please modify this sentence.

   a. Line 99: All pharmacists had to have at least 10 patients -> All pharmacists tried to have around 10 patients.

3. Line 100: Authors mentioned: „national coverage”. I suggest to change it to nationwide coverage.

   a. Line 104: national coverage -> nationwide coverage

4. Line 107: Please include the number of pharmacists into the table.

   a. Line 112: Table 1: „Number of pharmacists involved: 61”

5. In methods, there is no information how the pharmacies were selected / recruited for participating in the study? It was a random selection or a voluntary application, etc.? Please give a short description.

   a. Line 86: “The participation of pharmacists was obligatory to complete the second year of the training, and the cooperative pharmacies were their own workplaces. All participating pharmacies were accredited at the Semmelweis University.”
Results:

1. Line 139: The authors mentioned: „...540 patients from 606 patients...” However, in Table 1 I did not find 540 patients, only 497. Please explain the differences in patient’s number.
   a. 606 patients participated in the project (the pharmacists had to record the number of the patients involved). 497 of 606 patients took part in each requested meeting (at least one meeting/month for at least 3 months) with the pharmacist (traced patients). We tried to use all the data from the patients involved, even if they were not traced patients. However, in the case of the drug-related problems we could only analyze data from 540 of 606 patients due to the fact that not all data were received from the pharmacists.
   b. Line 108: “However we used data from all the patients involved, not only from traced patients.”

2. Line 166: The authors mentioned: „....(correlation coefficient=0.214).” However, in the methods section there is no information what kind of correlation coefficient is calculated (e.g. Pearson). Please give some details.
   a. We calculated Pearson correlation coefficient.
   b. Line 128: “When calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient, the p value for the correlation coefficient is <0.005”
   c. Line 172: (correlation coefficient=0.214) -> (Pearson correlation coefficient=0.214 (p<0.005))
   d. Line 174: (correlation coefficient=0.152)-> (Pearson correlation coefficient=0.152 (p<0.005))

Conclusions:

1. Line 232: Authors mentioned again 540 patients. Table 1 refers to 497 patients. Please explain the difference.
   a. see above
   b. Line 108: „However we used data from all the patients involved, not only from traced patients.”

Other changes:
1. Line 147: SD=3.1 -> SD=2.8 (typing mistake)

2. Authors: the order of the 4th and 5th author has been changed; see change of authorship request form.

3. We changed the corresponding author; see change of authorship request form.

Yours sincerely,

Balázs Hankó Ph.D.

Corresponding author