

Additional file 4: ANOVA and T-tests results *

	Pharmacist attitude towards generic drug substitution	Pharmacist attitude towards unified medical prescription	Layout/ structure of form	Outcome of policy	Relation with drug company	Functionality of form	Consumer acceptance	Pharmacist practices	MOPH Responsiveness
	Mean** (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Gender									
Male	3.96 (0.85)	3.27 (0.81)	3.13 (0.83)	2.91 (0.65)	2.70 (0.94)	2.53 (0.56)	2.76 (0.64)	3.28 (0.65)	3.13 (0.54)
N***	74	72	75	74	73	75	74	74	71
Female	3.57 (0.81)	3.03 (0.69)	3.06 (1.02)	3.02 (0.62)	2.8 (0.93)	2.41 (0.41)	2.63 (0.65)	3.29 (0.63)	3.08 (0.60)
N	72	67	72	71	70	67	68	71	69
P-value	0.005	0.059	0.614	0.291	0.488	0.155	0.229	0.912	0.603
Postgraduate Qualification (PharmD)									
Yes	3.84 (0.85)	3.05 (0.82)	2.74 (1.05)	3.08 (0.65)	2.78 (0.98)	2.39 (0.50)	2.65 (0.65)	3.37 (0.64)	3.02 (0.64)
N	56	55	57	56	56	56	56	57	56
No	3.74 (0.86)	3.22 (0.73)	3.30 (0.76)	2.90 (0.63)	2.73 (0.90)	2.51 (0.48)	2.74 (0.66)	3.25 (0.64)	3.16 (0.53)
N	92	86	92	91	90	87	88	90	87
P-value	0.491	0.192	0.001	0.105	0.784	0.161	0.438	0.272	0.146
Received teaching about generic versus brand name drugs									
Yes	3.74 (0.88)	3.25 (0.78)	2.98 (0.95)	3.00 (0.6)	2.78 (0.95)	2.47 (0.53)	2.69 (0.67)	3.41 (0.63)	3.08 (0.61)
N	84	81	84	83	83	80	81	83	79

	Pharmacist attitude towards generic drug substitution	Pharmacist attitude towards unified medical prescription	Layout/ structure of form	Outcome of policy	Relation with drug company	Functionality of form	Consumer acceptance	Pharmacist practices	MOPH Responsiveness
	Mean** (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
No	3.88 (0.77)	2.93 (0.70)	3.41 (0.81)	2.87 (0.48)	2.70 (0.85)	2.43 (0.36)	2.7 (0.60)	2.96 (0.50)	3.16 (0.45)
N	67	62	68	67	65	66	66	67	66
P-value	0.17	0.035	0.013	0.232	0.681	0.576	0.892	<0.001	0.441
Governorate****									
Beirut	3.66 (0.72)	3.06 (0.75)	2.97 (0.88)	2.92 (0.60)	2.83 (0.88)	2.49 (0.55)	2.44 (0.53)a	3.37 (0.60)	3.01 (0.55)a
N	31	28	31	31	30	30	29	30	31
Mount Lebanon	3.89 (0.82)	2.94 (0.53)	3.24 (0.93)	2.98 (0.59)	2.37 (0.79)	2.42 (0.66)	2.86 (0.54)	3.04 (0.53)	3.27 (0.48)
N	22	22	23	23	23	22	22	23	23
North Lebanon	3.73 (1.00)	3.48 (0.92)	3.13 (0.80)	2.93 (0.62)	2.90 (0.88)	2.3852 (0.44002)	2.51 (0.59)b	3.26 (0.70)	3.04 (0.58)b
N	28	24	28	27	26	27	27	28	27
Beqaa	3.96 (1.01)	3.18 (0.84)	3.21 (0.95)	2.88 (0.60)	2.58 (1.01)	2.45 (0.35)	2.82 (0.67)	3.17 (0.57)	3.03 (0.46)c
N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	24
South Lebanon	3.67 (0.68)	3.26 (0.68)	3.39 (0.80)	3.14 (0.70)	3.11(0.89)	2.56 (0.29)	3.09 (0.69) a, b	3.6 (0.64734)	3.55 (0.58)a, b, c, d
N	23	22	23	22	22	21	22	22	21
Nabatieh	3.79 (0.85)	3.00 (0.72)	2.67 (1.11)	3.07 (0.79)	2.74 (1.01)	2.51 (0.62)	2.61 (0.71)	3.38 (0.69)	2.80 (0.56)d
N	21	21	21	21	21	20	21	21	19
P-value	0.770	0.171	0.128	0.739	0.100	0.856	0.003	0.059	<0.001

	Pharmacist attitude towards generic drug substitution	Pharmacist attitude towards unified medical prescription	Layout/ structure of form	Outcome of policy	Relation with drug company	Functionality of form	Consumer acceptance	Pharmacist practices	MOPH Responsiveness
	Mean** (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Years of experience									
Less than 10 years	3.76 (0.83)	3.16 (0.68)	2.98 (0.93)	3.02 (0.60)	2.75 (0.93)	2.42 (0.48)	2.65 (0.61)	3.21 (0.62)	3.00 (0.58)
N	84	81	84	83	83	80	81	83	79
More than 10 years	3.80 (0.87)	3.15 (0.87)	3.26 (0.89)	2.93 (0.69)	2.77 (0.93)	2.53 (0.50)	2.78 (0.69)	3.41 (0.64)	3.25 (0.54)
N	67	62	68	67	65	66	66	67	66
P-value	0.794	0.915	0.061	0.388	0.885	0.182	0.223	0.049	0.009

* Results are shown for only the variables with significant association to any of the scales

** Scores range from 1 to 5 for each scale, with higher scores signifying higher agreement to the item being assessed.

*** N= sample size

****ANOVA test was conducted, values that have the same letter denote significant differences