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Reviewer's report:

MINOESSENTIAL REVISIONS:
- The objective of the study is suggested, but it is not clearly expressed, and it should be.
- Sample: the authors say that "The questionnaire was completed by a convenience sample". This sentence is within the section entitled "Administration of the Questionnaire". The sampling method should be described in a more extended way in a particular section, including something concerning the sample size; or, as authors say, a convenience sample, but explaining something more about it.
- In the Statistical Analysis section, it is said "Descriptive analysis". As statistics can be divided into descriptive and analytic, the term "descriptive analysis" is, in my opinion, incoherent, and it should be replaced by other like "Descriptive study" or similar.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS:
- The conclusion says that the study "demonstrates" (that there may be a greater willingness...). The word demonstrate should be used with caution, because the design of this kind of studies makes very difficult to demonstrate nothing.
- Table 2: it is showed the p-value for all staff combined. Would it be useful to know the p-values for nurses and administrative clerks separately too?
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