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Subject: Revised manuscript (BHSR-D-19-02035R1) submission.

August 10, 2020

Dear Editor,

Thanks very much for the review of the manuscript titled, “Knowledge of pharmacy workers on antihypertensive and anticonvulsant drugs for managing pre-eclampsia and eclampsia in Bangladesh.” As suggested, we have addressed all comments of the reviewers and a native English-speaking professional language colleague has copy edited the entire manuscript. Attached please find both files for your review.

We hope this revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in BMC Health Service Research. We are very grateful for the reviewers’ comments. Please find below detailed responses to the reviewer’s comments and descriptions of corresponding revisions made in the resubmitted manuscript.

This manuscript comes from original work and is not published or under consideration for publication elsewhere. The authors have no competing interests, and all authors have approved the manuscript for submission.
Thank you for considering publishing this manuscript and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Shongkour Roy
Population Council, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Editor comments
Comment: Please have the text edited by a professional language editing service or a native English speaking colleague. There are issues that need to be addressed before considering for publication, as the reviewer points out.
Response: Thank you for your suggestions. A native English-speaking professional language colleague has copy edited the entire manuscript. We hope we have also addressed all the reviewers comments.
Comment: We operate a transparent peer review process for this journal where reviewer reports are published with the article, but the reviewers are not named (unless they opt in to include their name).
Response: Thank you. We do not have any problems with this.

Reviewer #3 comments
Comment: The authors have addressed most of my comments and questions.
Response: Yes, indeed. Thank you for your comment.

Comment: However, I have got confused about the sample size calculation, which needs to be clarified to enhance understanding of the readers. If the sample size of this study was 404 (as you described in the methods part), then why you surveyed 384 pharmacy workers? Do you want to say that 404 pharmacy workers were approached; however, 384 responded with a response rate of 95%?
Response: Thank you. The information about the sample size. This has been revised in the method section for clear understanding of the readers.
Please find in methods section, lines 16-17, page 4: “In total, 404 pharmacy workers were approached for the survey; 384 responded affirmatively, resulting in a response rate of 95%.”

Comment: The English language needs to be polished further. See the following sentence "In general, there are mainly male pharmacy workers in Bangladesh as mirrored in our sample as like as other studies."
Response: Thank you. Yes, we have done it.