Reviewer's report

Title: Assessing the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ), German language Version in Swiss University Hospitals - A Validation study

Version: 4 Date: 13 February 2013

Reviewer: Jeremy Miles

Reviewer's report:

Note: I don’t think I’ve seen this paper before - I don’t have any record of it, and none of the reviews that the authors respond to are in my style, but anyway.

Major revisions:

Abstract:
1. I don’t think it’s necessary to say that the design is cross sectional.
   “... and relations to other variables, including factor analysis techniques.” Implies (at least to me) that factor analysis was used to investigate relations with other variables, which I don’t think it was.

Introduction
2. No one recommends the use of the GFI or AGFI any more. (Joreskog, who developed these indices, has been making jokes about how poor they are for 20 years).
   “20%” - should be 20% of the time?

Methods:
3. “to fulfill the criteria for a CFA (having at least 10% of responses in each Likert category),” I have never heard of this requirement. A source should be provided.
4. “The decision to exclude items if more than 11% of participants had missing data was selected to be consistent with previous research where the missing data rate did not exceed 13% for any item”. Mplus has sophisticated methods for handling missing data, so I don’t see the necessity for this exclusion of items.
5. The EM algorithm does not replace missing values in Mplus, it estimates parameters using the maximum amount of information that is available.
6. 3.84 is an extremely stringent cutoff for modification indices. MIs are not especially trustworthy when using WLSMV estimation.
7. I don’t think the results with complete cases only are useful These are likely to be biased, and shrink the sample considerably.
8. The method section states that chi-square will be used to determine model fit, but this is not reported in the text. The df should be given with chi-square in the table so it can be interpreted. If chi-square is over 4000 it is not necessary to report it to three decimal places.

The paper states “(significant chi-square indicates lack of satisfactory model fit)”, the paper does not state the df (and they can’t be worked out with WLSMV estimation), but it appears that these are very, very significant chi-square values. It therefore does not make sense to say “CFA ... showed acceptable to good model fit” when the model has failed the criteria set earlier in the paper. Either the fit is poor, or chi-square should not be used. (I’d go with the latter.)

9. I’d like to see the null model chi-square and df too - this can help with interpretation of the fit indices.

Minor essential revisions:
1. Should RMSE be RMSEA?
2. I don’t think it’s necessary to give correlations and alphas to 3 decimal places.
3. What version of Mplus was used?
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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