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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very interesting study, but there are several important remarks to make:

1. In this study the researchers have chosen to use a sampling method with 50 hospitals, randomly selected. In these 50 hospitals 20 staff members were selected with roughly 6 physicians, 12 nurses and 2 administrators. It is unclear why this method has been chosen and this should be motivated clearly. Most patient safety culture research, but also the QHRQ database, focuses on the whole (clinical) population of the hospital.

2. What is the motivation of the administrators proportion in the sample size, also from the perspective that 92,5% of them did not have direct contact with the patient? But, and that is a serious problem, the sample size consists 38,8% supervisors and this proportion can’t be representative for the hospital population.

The data need to represented form this perspective:
- what are the scores on the 12 dimensions for the supervision group
- what are the scores on the 12 dimensions for the non – supervision group.

This is important while supervisors tend to give better scores, certainly in evaluating their own work in dimension 3: management support for patient safety.

3. It is unclear why most of the respondents worked in their hospital for an average period op 5 years. This is low, compared with other patient safety culture studies. Explanation?

4. The statement: “in Western culture, the frequency of events reported represents employees’ commitment to the organisation, can committing to the organisation is considered a top priority for employees” need to be clarified.

5. In this study no critical reflexions about the research approach, the weak points or the concerns are formulated.
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