Dear Editor and Reviewer,

We appreciate your valuable feedbacks and comments. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript (yellow highlight with line number information).

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments and concerns.

We hope the revised manuscript is better, and we thank you for continued interest in our research.

Yours Faithfully,

Sarah Almira

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Reviewer’s Comments | Author’s Responses |
| 1 | What’s the different if both group (intervention & control) were educated by leaflets/videos?  Do you mean the treatment group were educated through leaflets and the other were educated through videos? | We've modified the sentence regarding the distinction between the two groups (**lines 181-187**).  The following are the differences between the two groups:   * The subjects in the control group received only verbal instruction and no media-based education, such as pamphlets, videos, etc (**see on intervention subsection**). * Subjects in the experimental group were educated verbally and through media such as videos, pamphlets, etc (**see on comparator/control section**). * Intervention / Exposure   Pharmacists provide verbal or face-to-face instruction on the proper use of inhalers, supplemented by leaflets, videos, and other media.   * Comparator / Control   Education on inhaler use techniques by pharmacists only verbal or face-to-face. |
| 2 | What about if there are some studies used generic instrument of QoL? Will it be excluded? | CAT and SGRQ are not the only quality-of-life instruments used in this systematic review, as shown in **Supplementary Table 1**. The search engine keywords are displayed in Supplementary Table 1. If the search results identified a generic quality of life instrument, it was still evaluated based on the inclusion criteria established for this systematic review.  We apologize that the supplement table is not accessible on the JRI website; I will attach it to the email at this moment. |
| 3 | It’s not mention here of excluded studies which used generic instrument of QoL.  Did you exclude grey literatures too? | The generic instrument of quality of life was not excluded. We have modified the sentence in the subcategory outcome (**lines 188-193**) :  The primary outcome is an assessment of the quality of life of COPD patients assessed using the COPD Assessment Test (CAT), St. George Respiratory Question (SGRQ), and Other Instrument of Quality of Life.  We did not find the grey literature when searching by hand searching. |
| 4 | It would be bias if only 2 reviewers. It should be in odd number | We have added information that three reviewers performed data extraction. If there are discrepancies in data extraction, the third reviewer acts as a decision-maker (**Line 201-204**) :  All research articles were extracted by two reviewers (SA and VP) using Microsoft Excel and Mendeley. Differences in data extraction were resolved by the third reviewer (RS). The reviewers screened the articles that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria set by agreement with a kappa value of 0.86 (listed in **Supplementary Table 2**). |
| 5 | Please attach the PRISMA table too.  Honestly, I can’t find the supplementary files | I apologize that the supplement table is not accessible on the JRI website; I will attach it to the email at this moment.  The PRISM flowchart is listed in Figure 1.  In this session, I'd like to discuss the data extraction process detailed in **supplementary table 3**. |
| 6 | Please attach in this article the risk assessment bias result table | We have added the risk assessment bias result table to Table 1 (**Line 278**). |
| 7 | It would be great if authors do metaanalysis for pooled estimate, funnel plot and forrest plot, especially to identify the publication bias. | We have added the forest plot for SGRQ instrument (**Figure 2**). We could not create a CAT forest plot due to a lack of data regarding the standard deviation; however, we contacted the author regarding the data. |
| 8 | Why in bahasa? | We sincerely apologize for this oversight and We've altered it (Line .  **COPD risk factors (excluding age)** |
| 9 | I have no problem with the discussion | We appreciate the review. |