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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper. The authors have studied the contributions of a blended learning program based on peer evaluation on teaching drug-drug interactions to undergraduate students of pharmacy.

The manuscript is well written and the standard of written English is good. Drug-drug interactions are an important area for health professionals.

Introduction section: I did not fully understand the link with pharmacovigilance and the pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetic scenarios. I assume the authors are mentioning about drug-drug interactions (DDIs) due to either pharmacodynamics or pharmacokinetic factors. If possible, the authors can provide an example of the clinical cases they had used.

In the Methods section, the authors can provide a brief overview of the University of Limoges and its undergraduate pharmacy program. The authors have not mentioned about the body which provided ethical approval or exemption for the study.

In the Discussion section the authors can discuss other studies which have examined peer evaluation in health professions education and how their study adds to the literature.

The tables, figures and supplementary materials add to the information presented in the text.

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.

Unable to assess
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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

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?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

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.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal