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Reviewer’s report:

"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed the previous reviewer's concerns sufficiently for you to recommend the revised work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: I'm stepping in for the original Reviewer #2 who was not available for the revision. I think the authors have addressed Reviewer #2's feedback in their comments, clarifying that this paper is not a traditional RCT, but a companion paper to the study describing the process they carried out.

I think they've described their process thoroughly by outlining each step in the implementation of the medication review. I do think they could be more specific in both the abstract and introduction by stating that the purpose of this paper is to describe the process and not just study outcomes. The abstract reads more like the aim of the paper is to present quantitative findings.

The Analyses section (p.9) is too brief. They've only allocated 2 sentences to describe the qualitative analysis conducted; this warrants more information, along with a reference to support qualitative analysis (something simple like Creswell 2003 would suffice). I would recommend a table to list the barriers and promotors themes that were identified, and/or this could be more clearly stated in the barriers/promotors section (p.11). For example, a sentence stating ""The barriers identified included x, y and z."" followed by descriptions of x, y and z with representative quotes. Then another sentence stating ""The promotors identified included a, b and c."" following by descriptions of a, b and c with representative quotes.

Overall the paper needs copy editing for minor grammatical and spelling errors throughout."

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
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

Declaration of competing interests  
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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