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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a novel, important paper because it draws together a suite of methods, tools, and indicators of patient safety in general practice. This is of relevance internationally to policy makers. The authors used an established group judgement process and recognise the limitations of the approach. They draw appropriate conclusions and highlight opportunities for further work. The article is well written and makes appropriate use of tables.

Authors have detailed how they have undertaken the RAND / UCLA Appropriateness Method. They provided participants with a synthesis of the literature on each item and considered the median rating and the distribution of ratings in determining agreement.

The authors state, "We developed and tested tools that can lead to interventions to improve patient safety outcomes in general practice akin to what has been done in hospital settings." This will require further work and needs clarification here to reflect what was actually done i.e. they have identified methods, tools or indicators judged (potentially) feasible by a group of experts. To my knowledge, those listed in 'acknowledgements' are recognised experts in primary care patient safety.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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