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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor:

Thank you very much for your letter and advice from reviewers for our manuscript (AOPH-D-19-00276R2). We have carefully revised the paper according to the comments raised by the reviewers, and highlighted the changes we made in the manuscript by using the track changes mode. A point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments is below, and we uploaded the revision manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and we are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Haihong Chen, Yuqing Tang, Chenxi Liu, Junjie Liu, Kang Wang, Xinping Zhang
Corresponding author: Xinping Zhang
School of Medicine and Health Management, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, No.13. Hangkong Road, Wuhan, Hubei Province 430030, China.
E-mail address: xpzhang602@hust.edu.cn
Response to the reviewers' comments

1) The objective of the work should be better defined. The objective is not clear and the way to address it. It is necessary for a clear definition of aim, for example, it should include where the study is going to be conducted and what clinical practice guide will be assessed.

Thank you for your valuable advice. We revised aim of the work for a clear definition, such as where the study is going to be conducted and what clinical practice guide will be assessed. The aim of our work in introduction section was revised into “This study aims to evaluate adherence to the COGA drug therapy guidelines for HDPs in terms of time of drug use, route of administration, and drug dosage and to explore the corresponding associations with recommendation evidence in a tertiary hospital in Hubei, China.” (Line 84 to 87 in introduction section). In addition, the aim of our work in abstract section was revised into “This study aims to evaluate adherence to the drug therapy guidelines of the Chinese Obstetricians and Gynecologists Association (COGA) for HDPs and to explore the corresponding associations with recommendation evidence” (Line 28 to 31 in abstract section).

Method

2) Page 5: At lines 14-15: the author excluded women "5- without complete medical records" Is it possible that this is a selection bias? this aspect should be clarified, or at least included in the limitations of the study.

Thank you for your valuable advice. We excluded women "5- without complete medical records" is possible a selection bias. Therefore, we included this aspect in the limitations of the study, we added “In addition, we excluded women with incomplete medical records which may lead to selection bias (Line 302 to 303 in discussion section)”.

3) Access to the guide (COGA) is difficult (check that the bibliographic reference is correct). In any case it is written in Chinese, so it is difficult to contrast the criteria proposed by the authors. Thank you for your valuable advice. We checked that the bibliographic reference is correct. Besides, items of adherence measurement in our study were consistent with the recommendations of the COGA guideline in 2012, but this guide (COGA) is written in Chinese. Therefore, we translated these recommendations of the COGA guideline in 2012, and presented the translation in Additional file 1 (Line 122 to 124 in methods section and Additional file 1).

4) Page 6: "Indicators of adherence measurement subsection", the wording of this section is very confusing and difficult to understand.

We are very sorry to confuse you for our poor writing. We rewrote "Indicators of adherence measurement subsection", and improved the English language by English language editing service (American Journal Experts). (Line 138 to 153 in methods section)
Manuscript

5) In general, in my opinion, the manuscript has difficulties in following the logic and, above all, it would be convenient to improve the writing of the methods part. The writing of the article is not clear and difficult to understand. I think authors should try to rewrite the manuscript more clearly so that its reading is more attractive and friendly.

We are very sorry to confuse you for our poor writing.

We rewrote the methods section, especially “Measurements subsection” (Line 117 to 153 in methods section), and improve the English language of this manuscript by English language editing service (American Journal Experts). We highlighted all the changes we made in the manuscript by using the track changes mode.