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Reviewer's report:
A review of patient safety education in undergraduate medical education is of potential interest to a wider body of medical educators but the presented article requires MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

[1] Unfortunately, the overall written style is difficult to understand due to the structure of sentences and the use of unfamiliar words, such as “talents”. This requires major revision and I recommend that a native English speaker is consulted. There are also several minor spelling mistakes.

This paper has revised again by Prof. Bruce Barraclough, one of co-authors of this paper, and a native English speaker both from the structure and English language in very details way.

[2] I am unclear if this is the first review.

We think it is the first review of its kind especially with the quality assessment of the included studies

[3] The authors need to make it clear that the review relates to undergraduate medical education - including the title and abstract.

Yes , we did revise this point in the paper including the title and abstract.

[4] The use of "etc" needs to be avoided. This occurs in the search terms and also several times later in the article. The full description is required.

Yes, we did have revised it.

[5] The authors discuss the implications for China (which is understandable due to the authorship). However, I recommend that either the article has a focus on China or it is made more generalisable.

[6] The discussion requires more critical discussion, such as the challenge of integrating "bolt on" or optional courses onto existing curricula (especially in the widely used PBL curricula)and also the role of simulation training.

The above two points have been revised or rewrote in Discussion Part,
especially on page 11 to 12 and conclusion based on the requirements.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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