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Reviewer's report:

Thanks to the authors for addressing my earlier comments. The results section is stronger now and the other changes have strengthened the paper also. However, I have a few additional queries.

Background

1. It is unclear to me if the previous study was a pilot study and this study is a barrier analysis for a further RCT or implementation of the programme in general

Methods

2. Topic guide mentions patients' experience of polypharmacy, but that is not a theme that is explored in the results - why is this?

Results

3. 12 patients were not interviewed as no new topics arose - does this mean you were analysing the data as you went?
4. First theme should be patient participation in MR?
5. This version seems to have fewer verbatim quotes used to deepen our understanding of the themes. Some sections have not quotes (e.g. HCA barriers).
6. "Most patients expected their GPs to have more medication-related experience and knowledge than pharmacists. They therefore concluded that GPs were best suited to conducting an MR." The quote used as evidence for this statement does not back it as it makes no reference to pharmacists at all.
7. "As pharmacists in Germany do not currently perform home visits on a regular basis, this physically disabled patient preferred a GP-led MR for practical reasons." Again, did the patient say this, or are you interpreting this as the reason for his preference?
Discussion

1. "structured MRs should explicitly 1 ask about additional drugs". How does this weigh up against the issue of patient autonomy raised?
2. I'm not convinced that the discussion points are always adequately supported by the data shown. For example, "The wish to cease taking medications that are no longer necessary and to reduce the number of drugs being taken was a point mentioned in both telephone interviews and focus groups" wasn't strongly presented in the results section. I agree with this as being a recurring theme in the literature, I just don't think the results section highlights it.

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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