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Reviewer’s report:

Comments to the Authors:

The paper is interesting to read, it represents a well performed study, with an important issue in the quality and safety in health care literature. Thus the study brings an important clinical and empirical material into the field.

The paper is well written.

In my view the following issues need to be improved before publication:

Major compulsory revisions:

1) The second aim of the study is not thoroughly enough worked with in the study; therefore there are some work to be done explaining this part of the study more in dept throughout the paper.

Minor essential revisions:

2) Page 3, the first time references [3] is used; I’m not sure that “Global Trigger Tool” are to be considered, as written, as a “well-developed system to monitor patient safety within the healthcare system”. (Jf. fx. Dan Med Bull. 2011 Nov;58(11):A4337. Uncertain added value of Global Trigger Tool for monitoring of patient safety in cancer care).

3) Page 11 section 2, the sentence “Although several studies…..the underlying causes to no-harm incidents”, should be moved to the beginning of the article.

Discretionary revisions:

4) At page 4 you explain, that this study is one part of a study design – perhaps you could elaborate a little bit more about the other part.

5) Page 8, line 7-8 from the bottom: I’m not sure that I understand “…0,34 no-harm incidents per admission (range 0-3).”

6) Page 8, line 4 from the bottom: “almost all” – I suggest you to use percentages instead.

7) Page 9 section “Place of occurrence of no-harm incidents”: the percentages should be included after all the numbers mentioned.

8) Page 12, line 8 and 11 from the bottom: I’m not sure that I understand “…level A-D…”, and “…(level C-D)…”. 
Good luck with the revisions

Best regards
Dr. Inger M. D. Siemsen
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