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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written manuscript reporting a study of community pharmacist medication reviews in the LTC setting. The methods are well described and the results reported clearly and discussed in context of the literature in the area. I have a number of comments and suggestions for amendment, as detailed below.

1. In the background, please add the abbreviation DRP in the first sentence.

2. Line 78, page 4: please amend "at risk to suffer" to "at risk of suffering"

3. In the methods section, please detail how many community pharmacies applied to participation to give a sense of the response rate

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

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:

Acceptable
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