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Reviewer's report:

General
Very interesting paper on a topic with increasing attention

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
NONE

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1) Conclusion in the abstract not supported by data presented in the abstract

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1) "Background": include patient’s expectations in the first sentence.
2) "Results": It would be interesting to see how the number of claims developed over time, e.g. in the period 1995-2000 or 2002 and 2001(2003) - 2006. Is it increasing or stable. Is the risk in the subspecialities increasing ?
3) "Discussion" - "no claims from outside the NHS (ie private and general practice)" - it would be interesting to know what is the proportion of NHS to private/general about.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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