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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

1) The authors may more consistently explain the clinical relevance and consequences of polypharmacy and PIM as well as of ADE/ADR whose they are risk factors

2) The meaning of the sentence "Except for drug-drug interactions that can increase the risk of the prescribing cascade, drug-diagnose interaction or contraindication can lead to an increased risk"is not enough clear.

3) The authors may better explain the choice of consider two "different" cohort (2011 and 2013) with 78% individuals present in both cohort. Indeed, the logistic regression included only individuals present in both cohort. Maybe the descriptive analyses could be also realized in the cohort 2011 and 2013 composed of the same individuals.

4) The reduction of PIM between 2011 and 2013 is an interesting and clinically relevant result. But which factors/variables significantly influence the odd of having less PIM in 2013?

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.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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