PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (see an example) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Bibliographic review of research publications on access to and use of medicines in low-income and middle-income countries in the Eastern Mediterranean Region: identifying the research gaps
AUTHORS	Rashidian, Arash; Jahanmehr, Nader; Jabbour, Samer; Zaidi, Shehla; Soleymani, Fatemeh; Bigdeli, Maryam

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Ileana Heredia Pi, MD, MsC, PhD
	Researcher
	National Institute of Public Health
	Mexico
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Jun-2013

THE STUDY	Authors didn't describe any descriptive statistical methods used for the results presentation.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	It may be desirable that authors had shown a table with the main findings on the reviewed articles, and not only offer information about de issues discussed there. It may be more useful to inform priority setting for research on ATM in the region, one of the aims of the review.
	There is needed of a deeper analysis of the content of the reviewed articles that it allows to identify not only the topics they approach but what appears in them and which are the principal convergent or divergent points identified in the analysis.

REVIEWER	Aryanti Radyowijati, MD. MPH, MA
	Technical Director
	ResultsinHealth
	Leiden, The Netherlands
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Jul-2013

THE STUDY	This is a bibliographical review, it has no research questions. Considering the objectives and the methods, they are adequate. The written English can be strengthened, especially on the technical terminologies commonly used in studies on access to medicine in LMICs.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	As there is no research question, Question 1 cannot be answered. However, the methods did answer the objective of the study.
REPORTING & ETHICS	As this is not an RCT, the CONSORT checklist does not apply. Similarly on the ethical consideration.

**Please be clearer in the text as to what you mean by a 'bibliographic analysis'.

Thanks for noting this. We have now changed the term 'bibliographic analyses' which we used in the discussion, to 'bibliographic review'. We have also used the same terminology for our study throughout the paper to avoid confusion.

**You include all study types, and find n=151 articles. It would be nice to know something of their quality - how many were surveys, observational studies, trials etc.?

We have now added a paragraph to the results pertaining to the research methods employed in the included articles.

**It may be desirable that authors had shown a table with the main findings on the reviewed articles, and not only offer information about de issues discussed there. It may be more useful to inform priority setting for research on ATM in the region, one of the aims of the review. There is needed of a deeper analysis of the content of the reviewed articles that it allows to identify not only the topics they approach but what appears in them and which are the principal convergent or divergent points identified in the analysis.

Although we agree with the benefits of a deeper analysis of the content of the included studies, this went beyond the objectives of this research. However, in response to the reviewer comments we have now added Table 3 including a sample of research recommendations put forward by the included studies.

**This is a bibliographical review, it has no research questions. Considering the objectives and the methods, they are adequate. The written English can be strengthened, especially on the technical terminologies commonly used in studies on access to medicine in LMICs.

We reviewed the paper and the technical terms and made a few adjustments were made to the paper.