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Reviewer’s report:

The comments that follow require minor essential revision. 1. The first paragraph of the results section of the paper is confusing. It is not clear whether the interventions recorded were the same number as the patients or whether some patients had more than one intervention. This really needs to be set out in a table so that it is possible to see the number patients in relation to the interventions. 2. The number of unknown outcomes needs further explanation and if tabulated with the other intervention data it would be easier to understand and draw conclusions. 3. We need to know the impact of the missing data of the ‘unknown acceptance’ outcomes and why they did not include these in the sensitivity analysis.

4. (no revision) The analysis is basic but that is not necessarily a criticism as it need not be over analysed.

(The following is a Discretionary revision - 5. The omissions category it is not clear whether they are medicines reconciliation issues or drug administration issues. This is mention in the discussion as a reconciliation problem but not explained.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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