

Dear Editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Please see below for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Comments to the Author This study describes the Awareness and Attitude of Clinicians regarding Pharmacovigilance and the authors found that they have a low-level knowledge and practising. Some significant points should be clarified:

- 1- The study was designed as a cross-sectional questionnaire research and reached similar findings to the known literature. It could have created a difference if they could have sent the same questionnaire to the same participants after a while online education programme about Pharmacovigilance toward same participants. In this way, they could measure whether adequate education could change physicians' knowledge and attitude about Pharmacovigilance. Also, a few inquiries should be added which can elucidate why physicians could not attend the requirement of Pharmacovigilance. Furthermore, the questionnaire should be translated into English and it should be shared in the article.
- 2- The discussion has been mainly written on the comparisons between the findings of the study and previously reported studies. The article has already adequate information on the numbers acquired from the questionnaire in the results section. Therefore, it does not need to repeat the same numbers in the discussion. Instead of it, they should focus on the chief point of this report. The discussion should be included reasons for the low-knowledge levels of physicians.
- 3- Some grammatical corrections have been emphasized in the article with red colour. Kind regards

Response: Thank you for your comments. 1- Your valuable suggestions have been inserted as

follows to the article: 'Future publications can be derived from the findings of this study that are of great value. Using a questionnaire administered before and after an online or face-to-face training program, the contribution of the training to physicians' pharmacovigilance knowledge and attitudes can be determined.' We think that the question 'Which of the following factors would discourage you from reporting an ADR?' may elucidate why physicians could not attend the requirement of Pharmacovigilance. Also the questionnaire was translated into English and shared in the article. 2- The discussion has been rearranged in line with your suggestions. 3- Thank you for your corrections.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors brought up attention to the current situation of pharmacovigilance in Turkey. It highlights the importance of pharmacovigilance in clinical practice. The manuscript is well written. I have no additional comment.

Response: Thank you for your comments.

Round 2

Comments to the Editor

I had reviewed the article and suggested some revisions. I have evaluated the authors' response but could not see any major corrections that they have made even obvious grammatical errors which I had signed with red colour on the article. I had suggested that the discussion section should be shortened and focused on the chief points of the study but it was rewritten almost the same. I insist that this study is a cross-sectional questionnaire research that reached similar findings to the known literature. Therefore, it does not include any new contribution to the literature. However, I respect the authors' decision.

In conclusion, I would like to leave the last decision to the Editor about whether the article could accept or not.

Kind regards

Response:

Dear Editor, The grammatical errors were corrected by both us and the grammar editing service of BPG. We have shortened the discussion and deleted the parts containig some results of the study. Instead we have compared these results with previous simillar national and international studies. Also, we have added the questionnaire as recommended. Since the article was designed on a detailed questionnaire, it contains many and varied data. The importance of the article partly comes from this point. For this reason, further shortening of the discussion will overlook the unique and new information aspects of our study. We tried to shorten the discussion as much as possible in line with the suggestions of the esteemed referee. At this stage, we respectfully forward our request for the article to be accepted in its current form.