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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the reviewers’ comments

We are grateful to the reviewers for their time reviewing our manuscript and we have carried out their suggestions in order to make the manuscript stronger. Please see below our responses to all queries.

Daniel Coletti (Reviewer 2): I appreciate the thoughtful attention the authors made to my own questions/comments as well as to the other Reviewer.

Answer: Thank you for your time and your comments in the light of your experience in the research field.

(Reviewer 3):

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Title talks about medication errors and the whole manuscript is discussing reconciliation, medication errors and medication discrepancies. The title in my opinion needs to be modified.

Answer: The title was modified in the first revision in accordance with the suggestion from reviewer 1. The article is discussing medication errors, which are included in the term “medication discrepancies”, as explained. The aim of the study was to assess medication errors in the medical records. Based on the results, medication reconciliation is suggested as a method of raising the quality/correctness of the medication lists. This suggestion does not need to be mirrored in the title.
The English language in general needs to be revised I guess.

Answer: A native speaker with experience in the research field has edited the language in the manuscript.

Page 2 line 4, The first aim of the study is not clear to me. The sentence in my opinion needs to be rewritten.

Answer: The primary aim has now been rewritten/clarified. (abstract, p 2, line 4)

Page 2 line 10, Chi 2 better written as chi2.

Answer: Chi 2 is now written as chi2, in the abstract as well as in the Methods section (page 5, line 23)

Page 2 line 17, I think there is no need for (it)…. Grammar issue here

Answer: This sentence has now been modified. (abstract, p 2, line 17)

Page 3 line 6, Reference No. 3, is it related to the definition of medication errors?

Answer: Yes. The National Board of Health and Welfare is in this reference defining the term “medication error” like it is used in Sweden, which is in line with international use.

Page 3 line 29, what does the author mean by routines?

Answer: Routines in primary care in order to maintain good quality in the drug treatment may include, for example, medication reconciliations in connection with each visit to the GP, regular medication reviews and mandatory follow-ups of prescriptions and dose changes.

Page 4 line 7, aim of the study,,, the first aim is not clear to me

Answer: The primary aim has now been rewritten/clarified. (p 4, line 8)
Page 5 lines 6, 7 and 8, contradiction here ,, the author mentioned at the beginning that no measures were taken if any errors were identified then mentioned that researchers would have acted if an error with high risk of serious harm had been identified… Please clarify.

Answer: Thank you for pointing this out. This was contradictory. Page 5, line 6 has now been changed into “No measures were taken if any minor errors were identified…”

Page 9 line 29, (The method should be used),,, does the author here mean the medication reconciliation?

Answer: Yes, medication reconciliation was meant when speaking of the method. This sentence has now been clarified. (p 10, line 1)

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

English Language proof reading.

Answer: Please see above.