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Reviewer's report:

I didn't find any Major Compulsory Revisions

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Verb tense in the second sentence (on line 91) of the introduction is not appropriate.
2. Choose alternative way to state the last sentence in the first paragraph (sentence starts on line 91 and end on line 93) rather than ending the sentence in "etc."
3. Consider replacing the words "remembering doses" with memory impairment or cognitive capability or abilities.
4. Revise sentence describing pharmacist responsibilities to eliminate use of the abbreviation "e.g." in the text. If the list after the "e.g." is removed, the sentence would be just a fragment. This sentence is in line 105.
5. Clarify the wording regarding your reasons why the search strategy (lines 113 - 115. You state that their strategy that might not identify relevant publications, yet their analysis included more studies than were included in your analysis.
6. Clarify if your review of the literature was limited to those article published in this century. There may have been additional articles that were published in the last century that met your inclusion criteria.
7. Justify your reasons for only including randomized controlled trials. Many studies on adherence interventions do not have a control group, rather they use retrospective or observation data from their cohort to compare with the results from their intervention. This may have led you to exclude studies that could yield additional insights into the effect of pharmacists on adherence.
8. Clarify whether there were one or two studies with statistically significant results. At multiple points you refer to the article by Phumipamom as th eonly one with statistically significant effects, yet in line 224, you state that there were 2 studies with significant improvement. This line seemed to refer to the Phumipamom study and the study by Obreli-Neto and colleagues.
9. The first sentence of your conclusion does not appear to be reflective of either your results or the rest of your conclusions. The third statement (starting on line 287) seems to be more reflective of the overall conclusions for your manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Suggest authors reconsider exclusion of trials that included subjects aged under 18 years. This population is notoriously poor at adherence and proportion of this age group with type 2 diabetes has increased in the last two decades.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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