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Reviewer's report:

General
This paper is important since reports on “real life” pharmacotherapy of psychiatric patients are rare. Yet the scope of “polypharmacy” seems to be too narrow as the results also pose some questions concerning the use of certain drugs in different diagnoses. Though not being the main topic of the investigation, this issue should be discussed to some extent (see below, point 2).

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Results section: Multiple regression: variables included in multiple regression should be specified; results are displayed poorly.

2. The paper deserves to be discussed regarding the use of psychotropic drugs in general, since some findings seem to be not in line with general treatment recommendations, eg
   Almost all addicts are prescribed tranquillizers
   the high use of tranquilizers in general
   high amount of coprescription of antiparkinsonian drugs
   20% of F2 patients but 6.6 of F3 patients receive anticonvulsants.

3. References: the results of other reports concerning polypharmacy in outpatient care should be considered

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Table 3: Since some values exceed 100, I suppose that numbers concern the percentage of responses, not the percentage of patients receiving the respective drug. The latter would be more illustrative. The legend should provide information on this issue.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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