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Reviewer's report:

This study is a feasibility study of conducting a safety intervention (consisting of tools to improve the safety climate and a chart audit with feedback) within primary care practices in Ireland. The study is well-written and the methodology is described in adequate detail. Results are largely descriptive and no statistical inferences were made (suitable for a feasibility study). The conclusions are reasonable and supported by the data.

Overall, I think this study should be published because it begins to address the issue of preventable errors in primary care outpatient management.

However, I kept being a bit confused as to whether we were studying the adaptation and acceptability of the overall intervention, or looking at the actual findings from the TRM which was part of the intervention. This is one reason I made the suggestion below about clearly delineating the two interests.

A few comments:

1) I did not see an overall word count, but it seems long for a feasibility/pilot study report. However, the methodology is described in adequate detail and I'm not sure how I would recommend shortening it without leaving significant material out. I suppose the analysis of the TRM data could be put in a separate report, but I would leave that up to the discretion of the editors.

2) A sentence or two describing the TRM for readers who aren't familiar with it would be useful. For instance, what would constitute a trigger? How do the raters determine harm/preventability? (this was briefly addressed). I realize this competes with my comment above about overall length and is one reason why two separate shorter reports (one on acceptability of the intervention and another on the actual TRM findings) might make sense.
3) Relating to the TRM, it appears only one person reviewed each chart. I would assume there is some inter-rater differences. This should be addressed in the discussion as a potential limitation.

4) The study found a significantly higher number of PSIs than other studies. Is this because only a high risk pool of charts were reviewed? Or are other potential causes. This should be explored more in the discussion.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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