

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Evaluation of My Medication Passport: a patient-completed aide memoire designed by patients, for patients, to help towards medicines optimisation.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Barber, Susan; Thakkar, Kandarp; Marvin, Vanessa; Franklin, Bryony; Bell, Derek

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Nina Barnett Medicines Use and Safety Team, East and South East England Specialist Pharmacy Services and North West London Hospitals NHS Trust, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	13-May-2014

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>line 58 page 8 Eighty-six percent of respondents reported 'yes' they would recommend MMP to friends or family', and one was 'not sure' please give number for eighty six percent as not sure reported as one.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the results were more clearly split into the shorter and longer survey with questions asked and responses or provide the questionnaires as appendices</p> <p>This is another step towards patients centered care supporting patients to take ownership of and responsibility for their medicine related treatment.</p>
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>REVIEWER</b>	José Joaquín Mira Universidad Miguel Hernández, Elche. Spain
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	17-May-2014

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This interesting study assessed from the patients' point of view a tool for a medication safety use: My Medication Passport (MMP). A description of what has been done and why is clear. This tool is probably useful. This good practice is easily generalizable to other health districts.</p> <p>I suggest some ideas that the authors could be considered to review their work and offer clearer information:</p> <p>1. Conclusions, results and objectives must be closely related. In this case, I have the impression that it is not so. Among the objectives are quoted: to find out if MMP helped to foster good communication between patients and HCPs; improved their confidence about what medicines they take in order to help in</p>
-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>adhering to medication regimens. These objectives have not been evaluated. Results did not include an assessment of the communication and data about the adherence.</p> <p>2. A limitation of this study (author include it in the final part of the article but not after the summary) is a participation rate of 66%. Specifically, considering the method applied.</p> <p>3. The term 'shared' their MMP could mean many things at the same time. It is necessary to specify what was asked in more detail.</p> <p>4. It would be interesting to know if the study allows drawing conclusions about if MMP contributes to patient autonomy, if MMP produces a better disease and treatment knowledge, and the extent to which improves adherence or help patients to avoid medication errors.</p> <p>Minor suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All tables must include the N</li> <li>2. Conclusion section: do not include results again</li> </ol> <p>Some other questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the relationship between MMP and the registration of drugs in the digital patient record?</li> <li>2. How many patients in this study had digital record?</li> <li>3. Could authors describe in some details the MMP content?</li> <li>4. MMP did not include information about allergies? MMP content must be described to understand this study.</li> </ol>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### **VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE**

#### Reviewer 1

I have added (tracked changes) a number to clarify the '86%' and have made available the questionnaires as appendices.

#### Reviewer 2

1. See revised wording for the objectives - removed 'adhering' and expanded 'communications'
2. Added the 66% response to the text on Limitations
3. Explained what was meant by 'sharing' in the Method
4. Outside the scope of this study but will be part of further research

Also added n to the relevant tables but left as is the repeat of results in the conclusion section

It is also outside the scope of the present study to link with any digital patient record

Added a description of the contents of the passport; page headings etc to the Background - as can now be seen it does give space for entering allergies