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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very important work, unique in the field. Nevertheless, some major changes are required in order to improve clarity of information.

Introduction

Pg5, L21-28: The sentence "In 2012, the survey [...] and 34 to the 2006 survey" would fit better in Methods section.

Pg5, L 57-60 and Pg6 L3-7. Info on the impact of access to pharmacy teams on morbidity and the importance of skilled pharmacy workforce on equitable access to medicines should be based on evidence. Please, include references on this.

The main point here is that this Introduction text does not point out clearly the importance of the study. The objective of the study should be clearly presented at the end of the background section.

Methods

pg6 L2: The sentence "The methodology [...] steps:" is unnecessary.

The text is repetitive here. Please, "clean" the text with a better flow and presenting each info only once.

It is missing a better explanation on how data was obtained, both, the survey and the literature search. Who were the respondents? How was the questionnaire (blocks of info); regarding to the search: how was it conducted, in which databases?

A better explanation on the analysis is missing. E.g. what exactly the "Relative capacity change as a Z-score" is?

Results

Figure 1 and Table 1 present the same info. They should be combined in one same illustration.
The sentence "capacity is measured [...] of this report" would fit better in Methods.

Please, present all comments on Figure 6 in a same paragraph. Actually, regarding to this Figure 6, since the confidence interval is so high in each WB group, isn't it better to present the linear correlation between pharm. density change and GDP pc?

Discussion

Authors failed to consider the existing evidence when discussing data. There is no citation in this section.

Limitations should be addressed.
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