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Reviewer's report:

Although this is an improvement from the first submission, there are still issues that must be addressed by the authors.

Compulsory revisions

[1] The authors first page in the introduction gets into the heart of the issue but the second paragraph lacks organization. This paragraph can also be truncated as some information does not seem to add much to the intro. Please review this section and re-write to state the background with relevant literature, critical issues and how the authors are planning to address these issues in their study. Some of this is addressed but as mentioned, not in an organized fashion.

[2] The last three sentences of the introduction from "For these purposes..." are operational definitions for the study that should be moved to the methods.

[3] As mentioned in the last review, the statistical analyses section requires additional detail. It is important to state what predictors were entered into the regression model when comparing against the dependent variable. This section suffers the most in the paper.

[4] The limitations section should be reviewed carefully. All the ideas are there but lacks organization.

Minor essential revisions

[1] First two sentences of the introduction can be combined to say "adverse drug events occur as a consequence..."

[2] On page 7 of methods, the sentence "the coding of categories C to E lacks a clear implication of a medication". I don't understand what the authors mean by "lacks a clear implication". Perhaps, a better choice of words?

[3] On page 10, in the sentence "...the ten most frequent events in 2005 and 2006 were essentially identical...", do the authors mean that there was no significant difference between them? If so, the authors should state it that way.

[4] On page 11, the authors should avoid phrases such as "during the period covered by the study". Please state the exact years.

[5] Last sentence of page 14 in limitations, the sentence "in addition, there are a variety of definitions..." needs to be re-worded in a succinct and clear fashion.
[6] In limitations, the sentence "according to the German coding, then, another..." needs to be re-worded to be read clearly.

[7] In conclusions, the sentence "for example..." can be removed.

[8] In conclusions, instead of "e.g. the absence...", the authors should replace example with "such as" as the word 'example' should be avoided in conclusions.

Other comments:
- The methods and results were written well.
- The conclusion is adequate except for a couple of sentences that can be removed (as mentioned above)
- The statistical analyses requires major work
- The introduction and limitations lack organization
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