Reviewer’s report

Title: Adverse events recording in electronic health record systems in primary care.

Version: 1 Date: 22 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Ralph Edward Hibberd

Reviewer's report:

I am satisfied that the authors have addressed the main concerns with the paper, and have responded in a considered manner to my comments about non-inclusion of reference to the NRLS, although I suspect future work in this area will draw the authors towards work around incident reporting database. As the authors state this paper provides an initial look at the data, and the expanded discussion I think helps to set out a research agenda that will provide valuable insight into the findings of this and similar studies.

Can I suggest that the authors might wish to include a formal definition of adverse drug event in their introduction, with reference to the causal mechanisms of interest (i.e. pharmaceutical effect of single drugs, effect of combination, inappropriate prescribing etc.), as I think this would frame the scope of the paper a little better? Also, there is only one typographic change to make in the discussion, 'overall' is a single word in English.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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