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GENERAL
This is an interesting study in the area of prescribing errors and improving both prescribing and dispensing quality. However, the study could be further improved with more input in the method section, specifically, with more elaboration and explanation on cohort procedure and time series analysis.

SPECIFIC
Methods
Under the subheading 'Setting and Study population', page 4, line 11; study method is described as 'This cross-section study' while in page 5, lines 32 and 33; there is a subheading labelled 'Control cohort' under which the study method is described as 'a control cohort'. Please explain.
Page 6, lines 16 - 19; under subheading 'The trend of prescribing workload and error rate over time and the link between error rate and prescribing workload' it is mentioned that 'We performed time series analysis of prescribing workload as well as error rate during a day shift'. Please elaborate on this analysis ensuring assumptions were met.

Results
Analysis of prescribing errors
Page 7, lines 2 and 3; it is mentioned 'Polypharmacy was a potential risk factor as we observed that error rate rose with the increase number of drug orders (between 1 and 5) of each prescription.' However, this is not one of the factors specified by authors to be studied as factors were clearly listed in the 'Methods' section under subheading 'Subgroup analysis of errors' lines 39 and 40 as 'The subgroup analysis of prescribing errors was conducted according to number of drug orders, age group of patients, seniority of physicians, specialty of physicians and work day.'; and the number of drug orders explained in page 5, lines 41 - 43 as 'Number of drug orders indicated the number of orders at each prescription, not the total drugs a patient was taking at the time.' So, it is not clear why polypharmacy was mentioned here.

The relation between error rate and prescribing workload of physician
Page 7, line 12; it is mentioned 'As to the trend of error rate over time', but I think it is not possible to assume trend based on Figure 3 as it represents a snapshot for only one working day. Please, clarify.
Conclusion

Page 9, line 21; it is not clear how authors reached to a conclusion that 'No patient harm due to medication error was received'. This is because according to the system explained in the study, nothing explaining if a patient harm occurred due to a medication error, how this will be documented and reported.
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