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Reviewer's report:

An important topic area which has received increasing attention by patient safety researchers.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Design – justification for the design using grounded theory approach and aligning this to the aim of the study is essential.

2. Justification for the combination of individual and focus group interviews is required as the information garnered from each type of interview and the intent of these is quite different. Please provide some examples of interview questions.

3. Sampling – please explain why only scrub/scout and nurses and nurse anaesthetists were selected when the essence of this activity is team based, and thus necessarily includes surgeons and anaesthetists. Often a lack of medical involvement/support contribute as barriers to adoption of the checklist. To explore this issue without sampling medical practitioners seems to be telling on half the story.

4. Information on the number of observations, hours etc should be included. The number of teams observed should also be noted.

5. When did data saturation occur during sampling and analysis? Please provide some information.

6. Elements of rigour in relation to credibility, auditability, transferability and triangulation should be outlined and should follow the Analysis section.

7. The Discussion section explores the notion of team involvement, however, this did not appear to be echoed or supported in the data/verbatim.

8. Under the Discussion section, headed, Strengths and Weaknesses, the authors discuss sampling from different wards – and thus, the information gleaned which would be inherently different due to differences in context. I do not understand the basis of this discussion point or it relevance.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Some typo/grammatical errors throughout.

2. Literature Review – would seem to be incomplete in relation to literature on the use of checklists/timeout (see Makary et al, 2006, Gillespie et al, 2010, 2010).
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