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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors addressed all issues. Some comments are left, however.

1. I would advise to include in subparagraph Study Design of the Method section that patients could not choose the times the reminder was sent (authors' answer to point 5 of my previous minor essential revisions), as well as include an example of the reminder text in subparagraph Intervention (authors' answer to point 6 of my previous minor essential revisions). In addition, the authors' gave a clarifying answer to point 3 of my previous major compulsory revisions (on number of SMS reminders sent for multiple medications), however, this was not included in the paper. The same for their answer on point 4 of my previous major compulsory revisions (on whether the control group had access to the PMP system).

I would recommend the authors to include this information in the paper.

2. The authors did include more literature in the background section, however, some of these references might still not be the most appropriate ones. For example, the review of Fjeldsoe et al (ref. 9) does not specifically involve SMS reminders for medication intake. The authors might want to look at the recent review of Vervloet et al. The effectiveness of interventions using electronic reminders to improve adherence to chronic medication: a systematic review of the literature. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2012 Sep-Oct;19(5):696-704. And there are more studies on medication reminders through SMS (e.g. in HIV treatment, diabetes, etc) for improving adherence. I would again recommend the authors to look into the literature more thoroughly. This applies to the discussion section as well!

3. The limitations should not be a part of the conclusion at the end, but a part of the discussion section.
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