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Reviewer's report:

Review of Patient-perceived barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a medication review in primary care: A qualitative thematic analysis.

Thanks for asking me to review this paper. Despite the interest in interventions to improve prescribing/implement de-prescribing, the patient experience has been under-valued to date, and I believe this study makes an important contribution to the literature. It would be good if the following could be clarified/ addressed:

The line "patients seemed to be aware of problems relating to polypharmacy" is used multiple times through the manuscript (pg 2 line 7 and line 15; pg 12 line 15; page 13 line 16; page 14, line 21). The word "seemed" makes the authors appear unsure of this finding. Additionally, there is little data provided to support the statement in the results section. The topic guide opens by saying "Taking many different medicines can cause problems" - so I am not confident that patients "seeming to be aware" is based on their own experience of polypharmacy or whether it is because they had just been told that polypharmacy leads to problems by the research team. Please clarify this point and provide additional empirical data to support the claim.

References begin with the number 3- I could not find any mention of reference 1 or 2 in the manuscript.

Page 4, line 9-11. Please clarify if this qualitative paper was a component of the pilot study of the intervention (i.e. a qualitative evaluation?)- it seems not.

Methods,

Page 4, line 19-26. How many patients were GPs asked to recruit? What did GPs know about the focus of the study? Were they asked to recruit patients who had had medication reviews? Is there anything to suggest that the GPs may have picked patients that they had already completed medication reviews for?

Focus groups and interviews can lead to quite different findings- was there any evidence of this?

Page 6, line 11-14. Would like to see some reflection on reflexivity of coders/interviewers.
Results
Page 6, line 16. Any information on how many patients were asked to participate?

Additionally, can you say what proportion of the participants actually had had the experience of a medication review on which to base their views.

All results section: Differences of opinion are highlighted throughout the results section- this is good but I would like to see if there were patient characteristics, or aspects of their care that influenced these different opinions. Why did people perceive the role of the GP differently? What was it about their care/previous experience (i.e. influence of age/level of education/ level of morbidity/level of function/ social support etc.) that led them to hold the opinions they expressed. This deeper analysis is needed to add substance to the findings.

Page 10 line 4- did participates suggest who should do the med review in this case?

Page 11 line 20-22: what was the experience of med review like for these participants?

Discussion
Good comparison with existing literature. There is a review of patient experiences of deprescribing by Reeve et al. - while not directly related to med review if may provide some other relevant findings.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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