

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)	Chinese physicians' attitudes toward eco-directed sustainable prescribing from the perspective of ecopharmacovigilance: a cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Wang, Jun; Li, Shulan; He, Bingshu

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Xinping Zhang School of Medicine and Health Management, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei, China
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>1.Introduction The first paragraph and second paragraph need to be concise and pointed directedly to eco-directed sustainable prescribing (EDSP). EDSP and the significance and necessity of Chinese physicians' attitudes and research gaps should be emphasized. Based on instructions to authors, the order of problem description(Nature and significance of the local problem Page 3-5), Available knowledge(Summary of what is currently known about the problem, including relevant previous studies, Page 3-5) and Rationale would be acceptable.</p> <p>2.Methods The descriptions of methods is reluctant. However, the most significant description is not sufficient, such as "This is an innovative subject and may contribute to policy development. Authors explored the physicians' perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP from the perspective of EPV and obtained some interesting findings". However, there are several concerns: 1.Are there any details about the development of the questionnaire, if available? 2.How about the calculation of the sample size? 3.I have no idea about the measures to ensure the quality of the questionnaire, except for the confirmation letters.</p> <p>3.Results 3.1 It was not able to ensure whether the results coming from the survey was reliable and valid. The questionnaire used in this study had not been fully validated, only internal consistency (Cronbachα) was tested. Validity using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were not reported. 3.2 The expression of Perceptions toward API pollution in environment and EPV presented in table is more concise and acceptable. The words expression of Perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP should be more concise with the Table providing sufficient data.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>3.3 The items 6-7 in Table 2 is not very explicit which would influence its validity, which is not conducted in this study.</p> <p>3.4 The relationship between Table 2 and Table 3 can be further explored.</p> <p>Due to lack of literature review and hypotheses, the analytic framework is not clear enough.</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Simona BUNGAU University of Oradea Romania
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Dec-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The subject of the paper is an interesting one and approached in a proper manner. It can be observed the sustained work of the authors related to this research. The novelty aspect arises from the recommendations/suggestions made for further implementing EDSP from the perspective of EPV in practice</p> <p>However, I find that the following punctual suggestions would improve the aspect and content of this paper:</p> <p>Abstract L19. A sentence beginning with “And” does not sounds good. Please reshape it. Results part should be reshaped, information should be expressed much more succinct and concrete, instead of quoting from the answers of the questionnaire</p> <p>Table 2. I suggest the following Head of the Table Participant' characteristics Respondents No. %</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Dr Shazia Jamshed International Islamic University Malaysia, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Dec-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>It is a novel work and well executed. The manuscript is written but following justifications are required.</p> <p>1) Which previous research instruments or research contents being taken into consideration for making the questionnaire? Please elaborate on that?</p> <p>2) Compute the cronbach alpha for every domain separately?</p> <p>3) Chi square is insufficient to draw any inferences? Please apply advanced inferential statistics and better to consult any statistician in this context?</p> <p>4) Rewrite the conclusion and future implications of your research in detail.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Xinping Zhang

Institution and Country: School of Medicine and Health Management, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei, China

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Dear Reviewer:

We have revised the manuscript (bmjopen-2019-035502) according to the suggestions and comments from you and other reviewers. Please see the responses under following. We hope that the manuscript can fit the quality of the journal this time. Thank you very much for your consideration!

Yours sincerely,
Jun Wang

1.Introduction

The first paragraph and second paragraph need to be concise and pointed directedly to eco-directed sustainable prescribing (EDSP). EDSP and the significance and necessity of Chinese physicians' attitudes and research gaps should be emphasized. Based on instructions to authors, the order of problem description(Nature and significance of the local problem Page 3-5), Available knowledge(Summary of what is currently known about the problem, including relevant previous studies, Page 3-5) and Rationale would be acceptable.

According to your suggestions, we reorganized and simplified the Introduction section. The revised first paragraph summarized the problem and pointed directedly to eco-directed sustainable prescribing (EDSP). The 3rd paragraph in the Introduction section emphasized EDSP. The last paragraph in the Introduction section emphasized the significance and necessity of Chinese physicians' attitudes and research gaps. Thank you very much for your kindly reminder!

2.Methods

The descriptions of methods is reluctant. However, the most significant description is not sufficient, such as "This is an innovative subject and may contribute to policy development. Authors explored the physicians' perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP from the perspective of EPV and obtained some interesting findings".

Thank you very much for your professional suggestion! The descriptions of methods have been revised and the most significant description has been added into the last sentence in the Introduction section .

However, there are several concerns:

1.Are there any details about the development of the questionnaire, if available?

Thank you very much for your professional suggestion! The details about the development of the questionnaire have been revised in the "Questionnaire development" item under Methods section.

2.How about the calculation of the sample size?

Thank you very much for your professional suggestion! The sample size was determined by considering the availability of subjects and the feasibility of enrolling physicians. A review of existing literature indicated a sample size of 200-400 physicians would be adequate to ensure data analysis and generalisability of responses. These statements have been added into "Study population" item under Methods section. In addition, as your professional reminder, we realize that "the sample size was not determined by precision analysis technique." is a limitation of this manuscript. So this limitation is added into the Discussion section.

3.I have no idea about the measures to ensure the quality of the questionnaire, except for the

confirmation letters.

Thank you very much for your professional reminder! The description on the measures to ensure the quality of the questionnaire has been added into the 4th paragraph in the revised Methods section.

3. Results

3.1 It was not able to ensure whether the results coming from the survey was reliable and valid. The questionnaire used in this study had not been fully validated, only internal consistency (Cronbach's) was tested. Validity using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were not reported.

The "Reliability and validity of the questionnaire" item and the related description has been added into the Results section according to your professional reminder.

3.2 The expression of Perceptions toward API pollution in environment and EPV presented in table is more concise and acceptable. The words expression of Perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP should be more concise with the Table providing sufficient data.

According to your kindly reminder, we have reorganized and revised the words expression of Perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP. The subheadings are added.

3.3 The items 6-7 in Table 2 is not very explicit which would influence its validity, which is not conducted in this study.

The words expression of items 6-7 in Table 2 has been revised.

3.4 The relationship between Table 2 and Table 3 can be further explored.

Due to lack of literature review and hypotheses, the analytic framework is not clear enough.

Thank you very much for your kindly reminders! We have reorganized and revised the words expression of the Discussion section. And the relationship between Perceptions toward API pollution in environment and EPV presented (Table 2) and Perceptions and attitudes toward EDSP (Table 3) is discussed in the 3rd paragraph in the revised Discussion section .

Thank you very much again for your professional suggestions and careful review! We hope that the manuscript can fit the quality of the journal this time.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Simona BUNGAU

Institution and Country: University of Oradea

Romania

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The subject of the paper is an interesting one and approached in a proper manner. It can be observed the sustained work of the authors related to this research. The novelty aspect arises from the recommendations/suggestions made for further implementing EDSP from the perspective of EPV in practice

Dear Reviewer:

We have revised the manuscript (bmjopen-2019-035502) according to the suggestions and comments from you and other reviewers. Please see the responses under following.

We hope that the manuscript can fit the quality of the journal this time. Thank you very much for your consideration!

Yours sincerely,

Jun Wang

However, I find that the following punctual suggestions would improve the aspect and content of this paper:

Abstract

L19. A sentence beginning with “And” does not sounds good. Please reshape it.

Results part should be reshaped, information should be expressed much more succinct and concrete, instead of quoting from the answers of the questionnaire

Thank you very much for your kindly reminders! We have revised the manuscript to avoid the sentences beginning with “And” and quoting from the answers of the questionnaire.

Table 2. I suggest the following Head of the Table

Participant' characteristics Respondents

No. %

We have revised the tables according to your suggestion.

Reviewer: 3

Reviewer Name: Dr Shazia Jamshed

Institution and Country: International Islamic University Malaysia, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None

Please leave your comments for the authors below

It is a novel work and well executed. The manuscript is written but following justifications are required.

Dear Reviewer:

We have revised the manuscript (bmjopen-2019-035502) according to the suggestions and comments from you and other reviewers. Please see the responses under following.

We hope that the manuscript can fit the quality of the journal this time. Thank you very much for your consideration!

Yours sincerely,

Jun Wang

1) Which previous research instruments or research contents being taken into consideration for making the questionnaire? Please elaborate on that?

Thank you very much for your professional reminder! According to your suggestion, we reorganized and revised the “Questionnaire development” item under Methods section. Some supporting references have been added and marked in the revised manuscript.

2) Compute the cronbach alpha for every domain separately?

Thank you very much for your professional suggestion! The separate cronbach alpha values have been added under “Reliability and validity of the questionnaire” item in the revised Results section.

3) Chi square is insufficient to draw any inferences? Please apply advanced inferential statistics and better to consult any statistician in this context?

As your professional reminder, the Fisher's exact test is also used to determine any relationship between the categorical data. The related description and results have been revised in the Methods and Results sections.

4) Rewrite the conclusion and future implications of your research in detail.

We have rewritten the conclusion and future implications according to your kindly reminder! We hope that the manuscript can fit the quality of the journal this time.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Shazia Jamshed IIUM, MALAYSIA
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Feb-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors successfully address all the comments.