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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised manuscript to BMC Geriatrics.

Please find below a point-by-point response to each comment that we received.

Three Editorial points:

1)”Please provide a full Declarations section using all the subheadings listed below. In particular please add details on ethical approval and consent to this section”.

We amended the Declaration section with the following new subheads:
line 282 page 12 “Ethics approval and consent to participate: No formal ethical approval was needed for this study”.
line 284 page 13 “Consent for publication: Not applicable”.
line 292 page 13 “Funding: The study was funded by The Norwegian Research Council and the Nursing Home Agency in Oslo municipality”
line 305 page 14 “Acknowledgments: Not applicable”

We revised the Authors contributions, line 297 page 13: “AFF, JS, KE and HBS were involved in the study design and contributed to writing the manuscript. HBS and AFF retrieved the drug use data. AFF drafted the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript”.

We also revised the order of the subheads to comply with the guideline. Thus, we moved the paragraph on Availability of data and materials to line 286 page 13 and the paragraph on Competing interest to line 290 page 13.
2) “Author Contributions section: please indicate if all authors have approved the final manuscript.” We implemented the comment by stating that all authors approved the final manuscript.

3) We checked against the submission guidelines for a Research Article.

Reviewer points: We received one reviewer comment, “I think the authors answered the majority of questions. I still think they need to add p along HR values.” We implemented the comment by adding the p-values for the relative risk in the relevant tables, thus Table 2 (line 433 page 21) and Table 3 (line 444 page 23).

In addition to the above revisions, we also corrected the followings: one confidence interval for relative risk for Inhalators in Table 2 page 21 (from 0.1, 0.1 to 0.9, 0.1) and we stated the period of the medication review in months instead of years (from 2012-14 to November 2011 – February 2014) in the Abstract line 31 page 2 and in the Methods line 99 page 5.

We performed to small language revisions, one in Discussion line 204 page 9 (we deleted “in Oslo”) and the other one in the Conclusion line 272 page 12 (we deleted “to”).

We enclose the manuscript with all revisions indicated by track changes.

We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in BMC Geriatrics.

Yours sincerely,

Amura Francesca Fog, on behalf of the authors