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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The authors’ aim was to compare drug use between older people living at home or in a nursing home in Oslo, Norway.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

There are many issues I find with this article:

1. The issue with the idea and scientific use: People living in nursing homes and at home, even at the same age, are very different types of population. Nursing home patients - and this is proven - are older and have a higher disease burden. Hence, comparing drug use between these two population and NOT taking in consideration the diagnoses and morbidity difference is useless. It's like comparing patients from oncology dept and surgical dept, and concluding that surgical dept patients use more gauzes. It's true but not really scientifically significant, like comparing apples with oranges.

2. What this study adds globally: Secondly, the main depth of the issue has already been shown in different studies, so basically, all this study adds is such information in Oslo.

3. The purpose is lacking: although the authors state their aim they do not clarify what is the purpose and whether they have hypotheses; in other words - why do they want to do what they embarked on doing? What are the implications? What is the use of such study?
4. the methodology is dubious: Comparing medication that is being bought every 3 months compared to medication used is dubious whether it is correct representation. Additional problem: the authors considered regular and PRN drugs as one prescription! This is unacceptable as some drugs could be 90% used as needed, and hence do not represent the accurate usage of drugs!

5. Grammatics: it's not minor opioids but weak opioids.

6. The conclusion is not accurate completely: they conclude that the difference in drug use is indicative of more symptomatic and palliative approach in the nursing home which could be a hypothesis, but not a conclusion. Additionally, you cannot conclude with anything including quality of life as you have not measured it!

7. What I think should be the focus of such study: the idea of deprescription and possible useless drugs based on some guidelines!

As mentioned: objective is dubious as it is comparing apples and oranges - they should compare it by diagnosis or Charleston morbidity score. Design + execution: you cannot take PRN drugs and regular drugs as one type. Interpretation: you cannot talk about quality of life if you haven't taken it in consideration. Lack of addition to scientific data.
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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?
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