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Reviewer’s report:

Please number your comments and divide them into

Minor Essential Revisions

Thank you for the opportunity to read this interesting manuscript systematically reviewing and analyzing quality standards in published drug management programs. The research question is thoughtful, and the analysis appears strong. The main concern with this manuscript is that it would benefit from proofreading. There are a number of grammatical and typographical errors that the authors can and should easily correct prior to publication.

In the methods section, the authors state that “When a reviewer was uncertain about an article’s inclusion, a second reviewer assessed the article…” This statement implies that only one reviewer evaluated each published report to decide whether it should or should not be included in the study? If this is so, please state this clearly.

It is not clear why certain drug management tool categories were specifically selected. Please clarify whether these were “standard” drug management tool categories and/or whether these were selected for particular a priori reasons.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

What next?

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)

Level of interest

BMC Medical Education has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?

If you feel that the manuscript needs to be seen by a statistician, but are unable to assess it yourself then please could you suggest alternative experts in your confidential comments to the editors.

No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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