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Reviewer’s report:

No major compulsory revisions

Essential minor revisions:

1. Please make the 3 groups and how they differ more clear at the beginning. Perhaps a short table describing exactly what each group received. It was kind of spread out over the paper.

2. Please address the issue of faxing the recs to the pharmacist and primary provider. Do you know if they actually were received and read? If receipt and review was low (i.e., they were commonly discarded) that may have affected the results.

3. Why did you choose the 3 services that you recruited from? What was it about those services that led to their choice? Also, you state 3 services but then later say "general med, family med, cardiology and ortho. That's 4 services. Why were psych, surgery and hem/onc excluded?

4. It is unclear if the intervention pharmacists were or were not involved in the post discharge review. Ideally, establishing the MAI etc. should be done by a separate set of pharmacists than those who performed the med rec interventions. Please make this clear who was who and who did what.

5. Would you be able to assess results including and excluding the self-reported events vs. those that have medical documentation? Self-reported events may be unreliable.

6. Do you think the differences in "forgetting medication" across the groups contributed to the results, i.e., this factor was not well randomized despite your study design? Given the results in the minimal care arm, it would appear not to be the case but it should be mentioned.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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