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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is much improved. It is well written and interesting to read. It will make an important contribution to the literature. All of my comments and suggestions from the first review have been adequately addressed. I identified three remaining items that need to be addressed.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. On page 10 in the data analysis section: When you did the regression analyses, did you only use data from nurses? The answer to the research question about whether the nursing staff or nurse aide was needed suggests that you did. If so, add the fact that you limited those analyses to just the nurse data, excluding the nurse aide data, into the data analysis section. If you used the data from nurse aides as well, the results statements need to be edited to reflect that it was the perception of all participants.

2. On page 11 in the "reasons for call light use" you have a contradiction about which reason was "most often identified." That should be corrected.

Discretionary Revision
3. On page 12 in the "nature of call lights" paragraph, you report the chi-square results as "associations." This is not inaccurate; however, staff nurse consumers' of this article will likely have difficulty interpreting that. I suggest that you change it to: ...significant differences between hospitals on staff's perceptions about call light importance to patients' safety and on staff's perceptions ..."

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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