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Reviewer's report:

General comments

The authors have carefully revised the manuscript based on the two reviewers’ reports. I now have only two remaining comments.

Major compulsory revisions

Referring to responses to reviewer 2, minor comments, point 4:

It may have been the consensus at this meeting, but I believe that it is neither reasonable nor practicable to disregard major medication errors if there is more than one per prescription.

Consider the following simple and realistic example: A patient has a prescription including a) 8 g paracetamol (acetaminophen) per day, b) lisinopril and spironolactone with a current potassium value of 5.5 mmol/l. If you presented this case to several experts, I do not believe that there would be consensus that there should be no immediate alert for one of those medication errors, and even if you were dogmatic about not reporting more than one alert at a time, there would be no rationale regarding which one of those two should be selected with priority.

Discretionary revisions

Referring to responses to reviewer 2, minor comments, point 2:

Of course, this is quite a challenge because there is no gold standard for the classification and evaluation of potential medication errors, particularly in the absence of patient-specific information; but there are some studies that compared different CDS / information sources with each other or against expert evaluation, therefore providing at least a relative sensitivity / specificity measure. At least some of these could be considered and cited if the authors considered them useful:

Olvey EL, Clauschee S, Malone DC
Comparison of critical drug-drug interaction listings: the Department of Veterans Affairs medical system and standard reference compendia.


Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety 2011, Sep;20(9):930-8
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