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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Mostly yes.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes – there is detailed information about the study included useful information about the tests. It would be helpful also to have examples of the types of questions available.
3. Are the data sound?
   It seemed to be.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The discussion unpicks and makes sense of the data and results well. I didn’t think that the conclusion led on from this though and am not sure that the study results show what the conclusion is suggesting.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Mostly, although I wasn’t sure where the system of deciding on ‘risk’ came from whether the authors had devised this or whether it is built on some theoretical knowledge? I also thought that more literature relating to self esteem and well being and why this was being studied would have been useful. More information about this and linking it to the discussion would have been useful to understand what the complexities are with assessing drug errors in nurses.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   I found the abstract unclear and suggest that this is reviewed so it reflects the study more accurately.
9. Is the writing acceptable?
Article needs some further proof reading.

**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:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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