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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review the manuscript entitled “Awareness and current implementation of drug dosage adjustment by pharmacists in patients with chronic kidney disease: a web-based questionnaire in Japan”.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The authors evaluated community pharmacists’ current awareness of ADDR for CKD patients in Japan and to compare the responses of community pharmacists with those of hospital pharmacists. In fact I’m wondering why the authors wanted to compare two different practice settings i.e. what is the rationale of this comparison and its implications to the practice and policy. In fact the difference between these two sectors is documented in the literature and the authors stated that clearly in the introduction (page 4, lines 17-22): hospital pharmacists can easily obtain information about renal function from their patients’ medical record; they can contribute to reduction in the incidence of adverse drug events in patients with renal impairment. In contrast, it is relatively difficult for community pharmacists to obtain information about renal function; therefore their contribution to the total amount of ADDR is relatively limited in Japan and other countries.

More importantly, the methodology part needs to be presented with adequate details (e.g. sample size calculations, method of administration (the authors mentioned it is online survey, so, how they ensured that only the target participants answered the survey and not the general surfers of the internet? How they choose their respondents email? Why do they choose this method (i.e. online survey)? What is the response rate? How many reminder emails sent?

Regarding the instrument/questionnaire used in the study, many essential issues were discussed in the manuscript such as the process of development of the questionnaire, its validity and reliability. I think these are two important aspects that need to be fully mentioned in details.

Some parts of the manuscript need to be revised e.g. the conclusion. The authors stated that “implementation of ADDR by community pharmacists is hindered by their limited awareness of the importance of patients’ renal function”. However by looking at table 4, it’s reported that community pharmacist considered aware of these aspects: median=4 (important). In fact the main hindrance is “Difficulty in obtaining information about renal function (e.g., serum
creatinine)” as shown in table 5. Therefore the results need to be correctly interpreted.
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