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This is an interesting article within the scope of this journal.

I have some questions and comments however:

1. This is an Australian study. Almost all references are Australian and parts of it are difficult to understand for someone outside Australia. Since this journal is read by scientists around the world, the manuscript would benefit from some clarifications.

   - Why is it interesting how many patients are Aboriginals or Torres Strait Islanders? Is health literacy lower among these groups? I have never heard of Torres Strait Islanders but I suppose that they are an ethnic group (minority). I suppose all people in Australia know this and also why this is interesting but to the rest of us it is not that obvious. Please describe and explain.

   - Surely it must be possible to compare and refer to more studies outside Australia?

Specific comments

Introduction

2. The first sentence has reference (1). Has this been showed in a study (1), otherwise is better to refer to the original study.

Method

3. What is meant by medical conditions? Current diagnoses, last year or what?

   How was information obtained about medical conditions (from hospital medical records, GPs, other clinics, all of them or perhaps from patients)?

4. It is not clear who did what. Who wrote MITF? Who audited MITF against DP? Who audited HDS against MITF? Was it one or several of the authors? Was it blinded in any way?

5. Why did not physicians participate in the review of errors?

Discussion
6. The sentence with reference 20 is already written in Introduction.
7. Reference 37 does not exist.
8. I miss some discussion about limitations, e.g. why did you not do a randomized trial, MITF or “as usual”?

References
9. All references have to be reviewed. Above all add references from other countries.
10. Pages are written in at least 3 different ways (ref 4, 5, 7 and 15).
11. Date accessed are written in different ways (ref 24, 18 etc)

Table 1.
12. Also here it would be good with a definition of Medical Conditions.
13. The numbers are written with or without decimals (8.6 medications but 4 changes, 7.4 medical conditions in Aboriginals, 7.3 in non-Aboriginals but 7 for all patients and so on.

Figure 1
Prescriptions should be prescriptions
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