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Reviewer's report:

Patient Safety skills in Primary Care: a national survey of GP educators Maria Ahmed, Sonal Arora, John McKay, Susannah Long, Charles Vincent, Moya Kelly, Nick Sevdalis, and Paul Bowie

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?
The research question is well posed, not very original. As stated by the authors the same question was already studied in secondary care. Yet, I agree with the authors that the question sure is also important for primary care and the differences with the outcomes of the secondary care research cab give clues for better understanding and with that improving patient safety in general practice.

2. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Data seem sound and well controlled. Authors describe their validation of the original secondary care survey into a primary care survey well. The survey they execute among GP educational supervisors is also clearly described.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?
Authors interpret their data in an unbiased way without exaggerating their (positive) results.
Conclusions are sound and well underlined with earlier research and references. Their comparisons with secondary care results are modest and give clues for better understanding the unique challenge for improving patient safety in primary care by educational interventions.

4. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?
Methods of validation are appropriate and well described. It is easy to replicate the same survey in other countries. In Holland we had plans for doing such a study and I think we would use a comparable survey. Statistics are okay.

5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?
Strength and weaknesses are well discussed at the end of the paper.

6. Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?
No critics on these items. Writing, organisation, tables and figures are clear.

7. When revisions are requested.
No revisions required.

8. Are there any ethical or competing interests issues you would like to raise?
   No ethical or competing interests.

9. Are the included additional files (supplementary materials) appropriate?
   Yes, the additional file is interesting and appropriate for better understanding the constructed and used survey.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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