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Reviewer’s report:

The authors of this paper have clearly sought to address the concerns raised in the previous review of this work. They have made it clearer from comments in the discussion the limitations of their sample and sought to justify why they selected such a limited professional group to survey. The writing is considerably improved.

Major compulsory revision

1. The methods and results section of this paper, while improved, are still a problem. The method of designing a largely quantitative survey are explained, then the results section starts with quotes suggesting an analysis of qualitative data – but the methods for this are not described. This work sounds like a mixed methods approach – with both quantitative survey data, and elicitation of more indepth data via telephone interviews. The methods of collecting the qualitative data – was it recorded, transcribed, subject to thematic analysis still unclear. The link between the quote and the text still remains rather unclear in places. The description of methods also seems to start reporting findings, the structure needs to improve.

Discretional Revisions

2. It would be nice to see a little more about why this work matters– the authors state that identifying the ‘most important’ and yet least well implemented patient safety strategies is a starting point for further research and development. This seems a valid and useful purpose of the study but the discussion is quite limited.

2. The authors include limitations in both the discussion and in the paragraphs entitled ‘strengths and limitations’. Structure needs to be improved.

3. Links with existing literature could be improved – for example links with any literature to barriers to implementation that may account for the difference between perceived importance and implementation of patient safety strategies.

Minor essential revisions

The writing is much much improved. A few grammatical errors still occur such as ‘but was not very much present’ on page 7. I acknowledge the authors are not writing in their first language and this type of error would probably be addressed
at editorial stage?

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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