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"Pharmacist-led Medication Reviews for Geriatric Residents in German Long-term Care Facilities"

Point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments

We thank all reviewers for their valuable comments. We have implemented all suggestions in the manuscript using track changes. In the following, we respond to the specific points.

Reviewer 1:
1. "In the background, please add the abbreviation DRP in the first sentence."
   We added the abbreviation.

2. "Line 78, page 4: please amend "at risk to suffer" to "at risk of suffering"."
   We reworded this phrase.
3. "In the methods section, please detail how many community pharmacies applied to participation to give a sense of the response rate."

We added this information to the methods section.

4. "Please justify why the patient inclusion criteria specified 5 or more medicines, given the range of definitions of polypharmacy in the literature."

The reviewer is right that there are various definitions. In Germany, the most common definition for polypharmacy is taking 5 or more medicines. Therefore, we have used this as inclusion criterion.

5. "Please amend "elderly" to "older people" or "older person" as appropriate throughout the manuscript."

We reworded this phrase wherever appropriate.

6. "Please confirm if all OTC medicines are recorded in the pharmacy software or is it only those medicines purchased in that particular pharmacy?"

Only those medicines purchased in that particular pharmacy were recorded. In Germany, everyone, including nursing home residents, is free to purchase the medicines at the pharmacy of her/his choice. Therefore, completeness regarding OTC medicines could not be ensured under routine care conditions that were aimed at in this study. This information was added to the methods section.

7. "In Figure 1, please amend "Pharmacy's data" and "Nursing home's data" to "Pharmacy data" and "Nursing home data"."

We have amended the two phrases as suggested by the reviewer.

8. "In all figures, please provide an explanation of the abbreviations used."

We added all missing explanations to the figure legends.
Reviewer 2:

1. "Sampling could be described (error, methodology). A justification of this N is needed."

As this was a feasibility study, a formal sample size calculation was not performed. Sampling was done as follows. All members of the Pharmacists’ Association North Rhine (more than 900 pharmacies) were informed about the study by a circular letter. Pharmacies delivering medicines to long-term care facilities were invited to participate. About 200 pharmacies declared their interest in participation. Among those, 17 pharmacies were drawn randomly. The drawn pharmacies informed their LTC facilities which decided upon their participation. Then, the statutory health insurance (AOK Rheinland/Hamburg) invited all of their members living in a participating LTC facility and fulfilling the inclusion criteria to participate (n = 305). At the end, 12 pharmacies with 20 LTC facilities actually performed medication reviews resulting in 94 medication reviews. Missing information on sampling was added to the manuscript.

2. "The impact in an international context could be introduced."

The study might be of interest for health care institutions and researchers not only in Germany but also in other countries developing and establishing medication reviews in long-term care settings. We added this sentence at the end of the introduction.