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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes absolutely

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? They are.

3. Are the data sound? Yes and the shortcomings that exist with it are well described.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes I believe so.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes they are

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes – the different legislations and hospitals / data collection systems are covered. Also the authors are clear that they are looking at paracetamol overdoses and do not confuse things by tackling the question of paracetmol containing compounds. It is a slight criticism that the impact of paracetamol containing compounds might have been -that is my only discretionary revision

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? The background to the legislation around paracetamol and the findings elsewhere in the UK are clearly described in the manuscript and referenced.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes they do

9. Is the writing acceptable? This is a well written article being both concise but also having enough detail for the reader.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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