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Thank you for the additional assessment of our manuscript submitted for publication in BMC Health Services Research, ref. MS2778863124998088:

**Medication knowledge, certainty, and risk of errors in health care: a cross-sectional study**

Please find enclosed a revised manuscript, with improvements referring to specific comments made by the associate editor marked in yellow.

**Editorial request**

*Improvement of English language*

The manuscript has been copy edited by International Science Editing.

**Associate Editor’s comments**

1. *Definitions*: A brief definition of “pharmacology” has been added under Methods, subheading Medication knowledge and certainty, and “drug management” is defined both in the Background and under Methods.

2. *Score range* for knowledge scores has been included in the Abstract.

3. *Item sources and validity of assessments*

The optimal test would be one used at the university colleges, but we did not find complete tests that covered all the items of interest in the study. The majority of the items in pharmacology were taken from university college exams, and the drug dose calculation test was identical to the test nursing students undergo. To cover the different topics in drug management, we collected items from both university college exams and running tests from hospitals. We collected some items, not found in actual tests, from questions raised at medication audits in the hospitals.

For the study, it was important to define an acceptable level of knowledge for nurses, and the pass mark for MCQ test in university colleges was chosen as a guideline. These assessments are specified under Methods, Results and Discussion, marked in yellow.

4. *Writing improvements*:

The manuscript has been copy edited by one of the professional Services mentioned by Biomed central (changes not marked).

We look forward to receiving your assessment of the revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Bjoerg O. Simonsen

Innlandet Hospital Trust
Dept. of Research,
N-2381 Brumunddal
Norway

Mail: bjorg.simonsen@sykehuset-innlandet.no
Back-up mail: bjorg.simonsen@ntnu.no