Reviewer's report

Title: Effectiveness of pharmaceutical care at discharge in the emergency department: study protocol of a randomized clinical trial

Version: 4 Date: 17 September 2014

Reviewer: Johnson George

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The title should have 'controlled' instead of 'clinical' to match the info in the text.
2. "inadequate blood pressure (BP) control (systolic BP ≥ 160 mmHg or diastolic BP ≥ 100 mmHg)" - what is the basis for these targets? If patients have CVD risks these targets are high.
3. How can the study be a double blinded study? Participants will know if they received the pharmacist intervention.
4. "For the primary outcome, we will initially consider in the analysis patients with complete follow-up." - why you are considering only patients with complete follow-up, when you have proposed doing an ITT? Can you use some imputation methods to have the complete data (e.g. use a last observation carry forward method)?
5. The Discussion requires rewriting. It should be mainly about your study. It is unusual to have the hypothesis as the last sentence. This should have come up much earlier.
6. Fig 1 has no numbers. Use the CONSORT diagram for RCTs.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 6 - is the aim to measure adherence or 'change in adherence'?
2. "behavioral variables" - what is listed here are demographic variables
3. Randomisation - will the authors use stratification to have a particular proportion or numbers of patients with high BP and high blood sugar levels?
4. "A secondary analysis will be performed with data of all patients initially randomized, considering, as the worst plausible scenario, that 29% of the losses to follow-up, in both groups, are nonadherent." - what is the source of this number? include the reference.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Can 'with admission due to any cause' be deleted from the inclusion/exclusion criteria?
2. "Since most of outcome measures are continuous variables, for the secondary outcomes we will include only those patients who attended the follow-up visit." - I don't get this....
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