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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I would like to thank you for giving me the chance to read your paper on the recording of medication adverse events by General Practices. I was able to acquire one report from an expert in this particular field. On the basis of this report and my own reading of your paper I would like to invite you to revise your paper according to the comments provided by the referee and myself below.

The authors should provide information about the country in which their research took place in both the Abstract and the Introduction.

The paper needs to have a clear research question, aims and contribution. I noted for instance that one of the aims of this paper is to identify room for improvement with regards to recording practice of medication adverse events but this is too vague. Is the aim of the study to identify problems of recording or to provide recommendations that will improve current practice and what is the literature to which it contributes and how. The paper should be clear, precise and consistent about its aims and contributions throughout.

The paper needs also to acknowledge relevant literature from other industries and countries such as the UK and incorporate them in their conclusions and recommendations. Reviewer 1 provides very helpful recommendations for how to achieve this.

It would be also helpful to provide a stronger justification of the patient characteristic you include in your study. This was mentioned albeit only in brief.

Perhaps more importantly the paper should provide a reflection, if not an analysis, of the results of your study. A key question concerns the reasons as to why there is poor recording of medication adverse effects. Reviewer 1 suggests that the study is unclear about whether or not the authors controlled for potential social and demographic differences between family doctor practices, which could affect near-miss reporting. Further, some reflection of the role of the software in shaping doctors' recording practices - a comparison between the two software for
example - would be most welcome. In your current analysis you make this point without discussing it in more depth.

Possibly the authors might also wish to set out the research agenda that this study opens as well as suggest how a qualitative study could address or follow-up some of the issues you raise in this paper.

I look forward to reading a revised version of your paper.

Sincere regards,

Dr. Dimitra Petrakaki
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If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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