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General Comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript. The idea or concept of this research is very interesting, and it is great to see interest in evaluating the patient medication information leaflets available. This is a straightforward study. However, there is a greater need for interpretation of the findings, placing the findings in the context of the literature, and discussing the implications of the findings, notably from the design and content perspectives.

The manuscript requires an academic English editorial review.

Specific Comments:

Abstract: It is not conventional writing to start sentences with numbers. The numbers should be spelt out in words. This should also be changed for the entire manuscript.

Background: A number of non-English references have been used in the introduction. Could the authors also include references in English. It is not possible to check the content of the citations.

Paragraph 1: Whilst the authors have stated that people with low health literacy tend to consult doctors, there is also evidence that people with low health literacy are less likely to seek healthcare advice, or discuss issues during consultations. In effect, information leaflets are less used by this group. This balanced view should be considered as part of the introduction.

Paragraph 2: Please cite the evidence for the fact that patients are more involved in the decision-making process if they receive clearer idea of risks and benefits.

Overall, it is not clear what the gap in research is in this area, especially in relation to the international research, rather than what has not been conducted in Austria. The study is not a national study in Austria.
Methods: How does the demographics of the physicians and/or public in Styria compare to the rest of Australia, and therefore the rationale for choosing this area?

What is the rationale for using EQIP-36? How does it compare to other instruments e.g. SAM, PEMAT? Is there any evidence to correlate data from EQIP-36 and people's health literacy levels?

Results:

Page 6, line 120-121: The sentence about selection criteria is unclear. What does this relate to?

Whilst EQIP-36 scores have been provided, the essence of the gaps in the leaflets is unclear. What are the issues associated with the leaflets? This should be an understanding of the deficiencies that have led to the low EQIP-36 scores.

Discussion:

This section is very poor. The results have been repeated, without any interpretation of what he findings mean, how they compare and contrast with the existing literature, and therefore what his study is adding to the international literature that would be relevant to other researchers in the field. Moreover, what are the implications of the findings in terms of current impact on patients, use during consultations, future gaps that need to be addressed, and policy implications.

**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.

Unable to assess

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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