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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes

3. Are the data sound?
Data are already 7 years old; problems that were found with the utilization might already been addressed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
I would suggest to rephrase the “more seems not enough” and make the title more explicit, by focussing on the drug underutilisation

The abstract should be improved. In the methods section I miss information on the outcome measures (partly included in background currently) and analysis. In the results I would expect OR’s for the effects found (and the info on study population should be included there instead of in the methods). The conclusions are currently a repetition of the results.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
There are quite some “typo’s” in the manuscript. Some I found:
p. 2 3rd sentence from below: “drugs” must be “drug use”
p. 2 2nd sentence from below: “unterutilisation” must be “underutilization”
p. 3 3rd sentence: “GP” should be “general practitioner (GP)”
p. 5 sentence 4: there should be a “,” between pain and chronic conditions?
p. 8 sentence 7: “as” should be removed
p. 9 4th line from below: the first “third” should be replaced by “the”
p. 11 line 2: “general” should be replaced by “explanatory”?
p. 12 line 1: the “,” between Surinamese and Antilleans should be “and”
p. 16 line 1: “with” should be removed.
p. 16 line 13: “a” (before musculoskeletal disorders) should be removed

Other comments:
Minor essential revisions:
- make sure that table 2 fits on the page, as otherwise the figures are moving
- how could you calculate a mean (sd) for income per month as is was asked in 10 categories?
- P. 14 line 1: “being male (OR 1.19)” should be removed as it is not significant in the table
- I have some problems understanding figure 2a and 2b. Do I read it correctly that e.g. 10% of the Dutch reports DM, but 80% uses drugs for DM. If so, this is a huge difference and indicates a underreporting of the self-reported diseases. Furthermore, maybe the underreporting is less for e.g. the Turkish and that means that there is no underutilization of drugs.

**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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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