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**Revision note**

*Thank you for your response and, in principal, accepting this article. We made some changes according to the reviewers reports (see below).*

*This article has been sent to a professional copyediting service prior to the first revision. We checked the English once again and made some minor changes.*

*We checked the manuscript according to the formatting checklist provided.*

*If any other changes must be made prior to publication, we would like to hear from you.*

**Reviewer: James Dunbar**  
**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions  
You have not understood the references I gave you. The work by Scott includes a lot of information about primary care. The Manchester Patient Safety Framework is a self-assessment tool for practices to assess themselves against known critical safety behaviours.

Your response indicates that you think a questionnaire approach is a strength. In fact, UK has spent a huge amount of money surveying doctors about patient safety and it has little benefit. No surprise. It is the behaviour change that matters and you won't necessarily get their from the results so include these things in the limitations.

We apologies for any misunderstanding. You are right that a questionnaire is not likely to improve patient safety on its own. We added an additional sentence, with the above named reference from Scott et al, to highlight the limitations of a questionnaire for implementation purposes.

**Reviewer: Susan Wearne**  
**Reviewer's report:**

Minor changes to the sentence structure e.g. page 2 last line should read 'selected next' not 'next selected'

*Done*