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Reviewer's report:

Whilst the authors are to be complemented on their efforts to address the question as to the quality of near-miss and incident reporting, there appear to be major omissions within this paper.

Firstly, the literature review appears to completely ignore any work outside the domain of healthcare. There is a considerable literature from other industries which describes both approaches to near-miss and incident reporting, and also the problems inherent within this (Koornneef, 2000; Speirs and Johnson, 2002; van der Schaaf, 1991). This literature should be acknowledged in the conclusions and recommendations drawn.

Secondly, the literature review also fails to acknowledge the experiences of the United Kingdom in the development of the National Reporting and Learning System, which might prove fruitful (Macrae, 2015).

Thirdly, and following from the other two points, I feel the authors fail to adequately explore the reasons for variation between practices, which the literature could inform. The design of the study, also looks to be slightly inadequate in this regard, as it is unclear as to whether the authors have controlled for potential social and demographic differences between family doctor practices, which could affect near-miss reporting.

Whilst I think the work is worthwhile, the above concerns should be addressed in any revision. Possibly the authors might also wish to set out the research agenda that this study opens?
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