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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript reports the results of a study aimed at identifying ADRs through the use of trigger tools, in particular the use of certain drugs such as glucocorticoids and antihistamines.

The study is interesting because it applies an alternative methodology for identifying ADR, but it also presents some critical aspects listed below.

1) Page 3, lines 68-69: Authors' statement is not supported by the evidence mentioned and in any case it is not common opinion that current pharmacovigilance methods are expensive and ineffective. The sentence needs to be changed.

2) Page 4, line 91. The authors state that patients were randomly selected. It would be interesting to know what inclusion and exclusion criteria were used.

3) In the paragraph of the results, it would be advisable to provide some additional details on the type of ADR that the patients showed.

4) Page 10, line 195. See comment number 1.

5) Page 10, line 10. The reference to adverse events is improper as it applies to investigational drugs. Delete.

6) The discussion contains much of the results already described above. Change...

7) Among the limits of the study it should be stated that not all ADRs require medicines used as trigger drugs, so in this study such ADRs have not been considered.
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.

Unable to assess

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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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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