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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for your responses to my comments. You have addressed many important issues. However, some of your responses do not fully cover my questions or concerns. Specifically:

1.) You indicate that there was in fact randomisation. However, you fail to explain the method used for randomisation. For instance, did you use a random numbers table or did patients get assigned simply by alternation (which is not generally considered a good randomisation method)? Was assignment done blinded? As it reads now, pharmacists could essentially choose who to 'randomly recommend' to what group. You still need to explain this better.

3.) Whilst you have added some 'definition' to the text, these definitions do not really explain much at all. An actual definition of a delayed dose could, for instance, be: "any medication that was not taken within 4 hours of the prescribed time". This is important as it helps to distinguish a delayed dose from a missed dose (e.g. if a dose is delayed by more than, for example, 12 hours it could also be considered missed). Please sharpen your definitions.

8.) In your edits, you have now chosen to display upto 2 decimals. This suggests a level of accuracy that is not possible from your data. I would recommend providing no more than 1 decimal point.

10.) This explanation should not only be given in the response to the reviewer but also added to the text itself. Given that this was highlighted as being unclear by 2 out of 3 reviewers, this is obviously an issue that needs to be explained better to the readers.

The writing style of the paper as a whole is still somewhat lacking. In the new sections that you have added, you have copy-pasted comments from the reviewers but have not always properly adjusted the sentence structure or tense accordingly. I strongly recommend copy editing by a native English speaker, preferably someone who also understands the science behind the project.
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