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Reviewer's report:

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.

General comments:

The aim of this paper was to perform a pilot study of medication review in Hungarian community pharmacies as part of basic pharmaceutical care. They used a drug-related problem classification for the first time to lay the foundation for a wider adoption of this service in Hungary. The Hungarian health care system is a solidarity-based health insurance system with a single payer (National Health Insurance Fund Administration). The authors used the Third Consensus of Granada on Drug-Related Problems classification system.

Specific comments:

Methods:

Line 86: Please confirm that all the participating pharmacists from all around the country went to Budapest and participated in a training at Semmelweis University.

Line 95: Authors mentioned that „All pharmacists had to have at least 10 patients." However in table 1. we learnt that 61 pharmacies with 606 patients participated: 9.9 patients/pharmacy. Please modify this sentence.

Line 100: Authors mentioned: „national coverage".
I suggest to change it to nationwide coverage.

Line 107:
Please include the number of pharmacists into the table.

In methods, there is no information how the pharmacies were selected / recruited for participating in the study? It was a random selection or a voluntary application, etc.? Please give a short description.

Results:

Line 139:
The authors mentioned: "...540 patients from 606 patients..."

However, in Table 1 I did not find 540 patients, only 497. Please explain the differences in patient's number.

Line 166:
The authors mentioned: "...(correlation coefficient=0.214)."

However, in the methods section there is no information what kind of correlation coefficient is calculated (e.g. Pearson). Please give some details.

Conclusions:

Line 232: Authors mentioned again 540 patients. Table 1 refers to 497 patients. Please explain the difference.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Yes

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? 
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