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Reviewer’s report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached.

1) I understand that this is a review paper that has looked at papers that have investigated the effects of drugs running concurrently with PN. In the abstract and the main text, the aims and objectives are not clear. There is no write up of how many studies were identified, what was the inclusion and exclusion criteria of this review and how many papers/studies were included or excluded. Furthermore there is no explanation of how the papers were synthesized in order to write up the results they did. It comes across as a paper that is potentially heavily biased and has not been produced systematically.

2) Some of the introduction is rather dated and at times incorrect.

3) Some of the studies reported appear to be single case reports which may well be valid however I am weary that conclusions are being derived from these papers and presented in this paper as possible solutions to medical problems when they have not necessarily been validated correctly.

• Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1) In some areas of the text there is too much written about matter that is not relevant to the apparent aims of the report.

• Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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