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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read and review your research article. You aimed to evaluate the safety culture and teamwork climate in the public Maternity Units of 5 regional Hospitals in Cyprus. The article warrants publication as the exploration of safety culture in maternity units is a crucial issue.

Abstract

1.1. Probably, there is a typographical error in the number of midwives (should be 106 and not 103 midwives).

2. Introduction.

In general, the introduction is logical and well structured. Good argument for doing the analysis.

2.1 Which is the birth rate in Cyprus per year?

2.2. The sentence ‘this means twenty millions…health care systems’ of the first para in page 4 needs a reference. Perhaps reference no 8 (from the reference list) has been accidently omitted.

2.3. The authors should specify if this study is the first (not only in Cyprus ) which aims to explore the factors that affect the safety attitude and teamwork climate in maternity units. If relevant studies have been published, the authors should cite their findings.


3.1. In the section of introduction, it has been emphasized that the midwives of Cyprus fulfill the International Confederation of Midwives “Definition of the Midwife” and the requirements of the European Directive 2005/36/EC that regulates the midwifery profession. According to the European Directives only registered midwives can provide care during childbearing. Therefore, I would suggest to include in your sample only registered midwives and to exclude from your analyses the two nurses.

3.2. The sentence ‘Based on calculations…was 108 person’ in first para of page six is confusing (5% probably is referred to significant level and not to confidence interval) and needs to be rewritten for become clear. The authors would be interesting to provide some more information regarding the sample size calculation.
3.3. How level of occupational stress and fatigue were measured? By using a single-item or a scale? These should be defined.

3.3. It is noteworthy to provide information regarding the number of the SAQ items and the range of the subscores.

4. Results. In general, Table 3 is very informative and helpful. Table 1 can be omitted.

4.1. Correct the typographical error in the number of midwives who participated in the study (should be 106 and not 103 midwives).

4.2. The authors could and should provide some information regarding the units that midwives worked (e.g. a percentage of midwives worked in labour ward while some other midwives worked in postnatal ward).

4.3. It is suggested to provide more information regarding the direction of a statistical significant association and not just referring that e.g. age and job satisfaction in the maternity units were correlated strongly. In what way? For example, older midwives had higher level of job satisfaction than younger midwives.

4.4. The sentence ‘T test analysis did not reveal any statistical difference between choosing the unit and the other variables used in the first part of the questionnaire’ is not clear and should be re-written.

The discussion is well developed and well structured.

Overall, I found the article well written and worthy of publication with some minor improvements.
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