

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	How do primary healthcare workers in low- and middle-income countries obtain information during consultations to aid safe prescribing: systematic review protocol
AUTHORS	Smith, Chris; Van Velthoven, Michelle; Pakenham-Walsh, Neil

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Manish Kumar MEASURE Evaluation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Apr-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The paper suggests a strong systematic review protocol to study health information access issues in primary care setting of LMICs. The objective, methodology and expected outcomes are clearly articulated. However, study limitations are not clearly defined under the appropriate heading. It is mentioned under ethics and dissemination. It will be good to reorganize it.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Muhammad Rehan Sarwar Akhtar Saeed College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Pakistan
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The article is well written and extremely incisive for the contents treated.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Claire Anderson University of Nottingham, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well written and clear protocol and will be a really useful systematic review.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Comments	Response
Reviewer 1: The paper suggests a strong systematic review protocol to study health information access issues in primary care setting of LMICs. The objective, methodology and expected outcomes are clearly articulated. However, study limitations are not clearly defined under the appropriate heading. It is mentioned under ethics and dissemination. It	We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for reviewing our paper and for their feedback. We have addressed this by adding limitations under the strengths and limitations section following the abstract.

will be good to reorganize it.	
Reviewer 2: The article is well written and extremely incisive for the contents treated.	Thank you very much.
Reviewer 3: This is a well written and clear protocol and will be a really useful systematic review.	Many thanks, we hope it will be useful too.