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Reviewer’s report:

All these suggestions are relatively minor since the paper follows a pretty standard format and adds usefully to the literature.

1. The abstract background mentions developing innovative approaches in health care but none are cited in the paper, and this is probably a bit of a distraction since the paper is essentially a descriptive study.

2. Results in the abstract mention AEs causing death. It would be more defensible to say that they were associated. Prolonged stay. Hard to judge how prolonged without some figure on the average stay.

3. Methods. How was the random sample identified? Was this strictly random, say, "out of a hat", or was it a systematic list sample?

4. Methods. Was any training of reviewers carried out?

5. How did the investigators treat patients entering hospital with pre-existing AEs (e.g. polypharmacy-induced admissions)?

6. There is no such word as criterions, and a single criterion is to be preferred to a criteria. Criteria is plural. Founded should be found. Economical should be economic.

7. Last para of discussion. I wonder whether you will have the numbers to do any further analysis.

8. Figure 1. Is that a percentage distribution, or a rate per age group?

9. Table 2. Does this refer to AEs? You should have a total row, with total N and 100 per cent.. Same for Table 3.

10. Table 4. Analysis not analyse. Any confidence intervals?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I have no competing interests