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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper which addresses an important aspect of care - patients' views on medication reviews. This is an important and often looked area of research and the paper is well written and presented. However, I have a number of queries around the results, outlined below, which need to be addressed.

Major comments:

RESULTS

1. The results as they are currently presented are not strong enough. The themes are not strong enough. The text is often repeating/paraphrasing the quote provided as evidence. For example:

"Although the participants discussed who should conduct MRs, it was clearly apparent that patients preferred their GPs. "In that case I'd prefer the doctor. I don't want to criticize the pharmacist. (...) I can just imagine the doctor knows more about side effects (...)." (P 13)"

2. There is no concept of how many patients said what - you can use things like 6/7 participants said...

3. The quotes need to highlight where they are interviews or focus groups

4. The results contradict each other, highlighting the complexity of the patient group e.g they want GPs to do reviews but also have concern that GPs lack sufficient pharmaceutical knowledge. These types of complexities need to be pulled out more for a more developed analysis.

Discussion

5. "The older patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy included in this study looked forward to receiving structured MRs annually" - this did not come through in the data
6. "Furthermore, we could not detect any appropriate theoretical framework from the literature to be used in our study." There are any number of theories that could be adapted for use so I don't think you can say this.

7. "One strength of our study is that elderly patients participated in both telephone interviews and focus groups" - both or either?

Minor comments:

Add country to the abstract

Reference numbers are not in sequence

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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