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Your email of February 24, 2010, 12:21 informing us that the BMC has decided, in principle, to accept the manuscript.

We hereby submit a second revised version of our manuscript, changed according to the editorial requests and the new requests of reviewer Christine Holzmueller.

Please find below our response to each request.

Yours,

Dag Hofoss

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Editorial requests

1) A “Competing interests” section (“No competing interests”) has been included between the “Conclusion” and the “Authors’ contributions” sections.

2) An “Authors’ contributions” section has been included before the reference list.

3) An “Acknowledgement section” is not added: nobody except ourselves contributed towards the study by making contributions to conception, design, data acquisition, analysis, interpretation, drafting or revision of manuscript etc.

4) The “Funding” section, which was already there, has now been specified to inform readers that the money granted by the Health Region Eastern Norway was a PhD scholarship for Ellen Deilkås.
5) There is nothing to report about the funding body’s participation in the project. The funding body did not in any way take part in the planning of the project, the designing the study, the collection and analysis of the data or the interpretation of the results. (That’s the way the Health Region Eastern Norway defines its role in research: it provides money, it is not a research partner.)

6) The manuscript has been revised to conform to BMC guidelines.

Reviewer Holzmueller’s requests for minor, but essential, revisions

1) “I disagree with the statement that surveying safety culture ‘is not always the best strategy.’ …. I think this phrase should be deleted”.

The phrase is now deleted.

2a1) “In paragraph 1, the second sentence starting ‘the questionnaire was distributed...neurology and ear-nose-throat.’ should be moved to the Setting and participants subsection”.

The sentence has been moved to the Settings and participants subsection.

2a2) “ALSO, the remainder of that paragraph in my mind should go in results”

The remaining part of that paragraph is now in the Results section.

2b1) “Data collection: In paragraph 2, line 4, rephrase: ‘..attend the staff meeting were sent [rather than had their] SAQs..”

The word “had” has been replaced with the words “were sent”.

2b2) “... next to the last sentence in this paragraph about response rates, again I feel it this should be in Results section.”

As implied by the word “again”, this point was made above, in requirement 2a2. The response rate part of the paragraph is now in the Results section.

2c1) “Paragraph 1, with the exception of last statement about procedure used to calculate scores, should be moved to the The survey subsection earlier in methods.”

The indicated sentences have been moved to the survey section earlier in Methods.

2c2) “ALSO, that last statement about calculating scores should be described briefly here instead of making the reader go to another paper.”

The calculation procedure is now described in this manuscript.