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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

[1] There is an overall feeling of "so what?" after reading this article - the authors state that it is the first (I accept this but no justification) and there is no appropriate discussion or detailed recommendations for how the findings should influence future practice, policy or research.

[2] The title, abstract and text talk about "most promising" but this was not the aim nor related to the questions asked of the participants. The study appears to identify the perceptions of the participants about the importance of various approaches used to improve patient safety in primary care. This aim and the findings are relevant to a wider audience but only if the limitations of the study are discussed and recommendations are made.

[3] The questionnaire mentions "guidelines" in several places, including the abstract. It also appears in Table 2 in patient safety management and education. This finding needs to be made more explicit and clarified.

[4] Clarification of the following terms is essential:
Hygiene protocols - what is this?
Riskfull
A guideline on patient safety - what is this?

[5] The authors do not discuss possible translation confusion for the items on the questionnaire and the small size of an expert group as limitations of the study.

[6] The overall style would benefit from a native English speaker looking at the article - for example, the first paragraph in the background is difficult to understand, and later there are words and phrases, such as telephonic and comprehended.

[7] The estimate of the implementation. This is the perception of an elite sample and any information is biased and this should be included as a limitation or (as I recommend) remove from the article. These percentages may be the perceptions of the participants but are unscientific. This does not apply to their view on the importance - this is more valid.

Minor Essential Revisions

None
Discretionary Revisions
None

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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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