

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jlpm-23-14>

Reviewer A

The authors present a highly relevant, first of a kind investigation on the challenges and awareness of clinical laboratories to implement PBRTQC in Australia. It objectively identified relevant issues and is well written.

I have no comments to the paper and think it can be accepted as it is.

Response: Thank you for your support.

Reviewer B

This is a straight forward report on the results of a questionnaire about PBRTQC. There are a few items where the report can be improved for better understanding by the reader:

1. It would be good to start the letter with a few sentences to explain the principle of PBRTQC.

Response: The opening paragraph now contains details about PBRTQC.

2. Line 21: replace "advantageous" by "advantages".

Response: This error has been corrected.

3. Line 31: There were fourteen closed-ended questions and Likert-scale items: I count 15 items in table 1.

Response: This error has been corrected.

4. Table 1: with respect to knowledge it should be answered if statements are correct or not; it would be good to highlight the correct answer.

Response: A column of correct responses has been added to Table 1.

5. From line 38 onward results are presented. I would help if the results are linked to the respective items in the table (I do not clearly see which items are involved and if presented percentages are correct)

Response: The results presented in the Text were taken from the open-ended questions asked in the survey. Table 1 presented the Likert-scale KAP (Knowledge/Attitude/Practices responses).

Reviewer C

Line 31: How many Likert-scale items were in the survey?

Response: There were fifteen Likert-scale items in the survey. It was incorrectly stated there were 14.

Line 40: For numbers below 20, authors should use full English spelling.

Response: This error has been corrected.

Line 43: This is the first appearance of abbreviation "QC", so the full term should be given, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses.

Response: This error has been corrected.

Line 66: Authors should use already introduced abbreviation instead "quality control".

Response: This error has been corrected.

Lines 73-106:

Maximum number of references for this manuscript category is 10.

Response: This error has been corrected.

References aren't formatted according to journal style, please follow the JPLM Guidelines for authors (e.g. reference 1 is missing the name of journal; the titles of journals should be abbreviated; if an article has more than three authors, the first three authors should be listed followed by "et al."; issue numbers should be omitted, as well as date and month of journal publishing, etc.).

Response: This error has been corrected.

Table 1

Table title: Authors should use already introduced abbreviation instead "patient-based real-time quality control" and define abbreviations in the table footnote. Also, sentence about presentation in percentage should be moved to the footnote.

Response: This error has been corrected.

Table should be self explanatory, each column must have an appropriate heading and measurement units should be provided in the column heading (in parentheses). So, please add column heading "Answers (%)"

Response: This error has been corrected.

Please list two more responses offered on a 5-point Likert scale.

Response: This error has been corrected.