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Reviewer's report:

The study protocol is well written and clearly describes the steps of a feasibility trial. It is suitable to this journal's content and is of interest to a general audience.

Minor issues

Abstract

1. The following sentences are unclear:

"Previous interventions designed to address this have been largely complex in nature but have shown limited effectiveness and have rarely used theory in their design. It has been recognised that theory can guide intervention development and help researchers better understand how complex adherence interventions work".

The word "theory" is much too broad to be intelligible for the general audience, please rephrase.

Introduction

1. In the following sentence, as well as in the Abstract, the use of "theory" to guide intervention is not comprehensible for general audience.

"This has been highlighted in a systematic review of adherence interventions delivered to older patients prescribed polypharmacy, which reported that only a limited number of studies described using theory to guide intervention development".

Methods

Objectives
1. In the following sentence, it is nuclear how authors are going to evaluate the mechanism of action of the intervention with their current study design.

"Finally, the process evaluation will seek to identify how the intervention might work to bring about change in adherence behaviours (i.e. the mechanism of action) using qualitative and quantitative data collected from pharmacists and patients including audiorecordings of patient sessions, feedback interviews and surveys".
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