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Reviewer’s report:

This paper fills a gap that has not been tackled in the literature yet. As the authors state in their introduction, a scale to measure safety culture in primary care outside primary care physician practices, has not yet been described. The authors clearly describe how they are building on a scale that was developed for physician practices.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1-They do not state why this particular scale was used to build on and not one of the other scales for measuring culture in primary care physician settings. They also do not state why they did not take into account the theoretical framework put forth by Kirk et al (which they site) and incorporate some of the dimensions found in this work into their new questionnaire. Although some of the dimensions are very similar to those from SCOPE, there are a few that are different.

2-The question is well defined but is not exactly the question that is answered. The stated purpose is to “develop and validate a generic questionnaire that aims to assess the patient safety culture in Dutch primary care. The question that is answered is “to modify and validate the SCOPE tool for Dutch primary care”.

3-While the methods are appropriate, I believe that they are described in more detail than what is required. The amount of detail makes it difficult to read.

4-The authors have used both confirmatory factor analysis as well as exploratory factor analysis. The confirmatory factor analysis does not really add to the findings and can probably be removed.

The authors undertook a reasonable recruitment strategy and I believe have obtained sound data on changing the SCOPE tool. They clearly outline the limitations of their recruitment strategy.

5-I would like to see another column added to table 1. Table 1 describes the percent of the participants who were female in each of the professions, but it is missing a column outlining the percentage of practitioners in each profession who are female so it is difficult to interpret the significance of the gender column.

The discussion and conclusion are supported by the data. The title accurately reflects the contents of the paper. The abstract accurately conveys what was found except that it has the same issue with the question as mentioned above.
6-The writing is somewhat convoluted and uses words and phrases in ways that are they are not usually used in English. The writing style makes it difficult to read the paper. I believe that someone with a background in English should edit the paper before it is resubmitted. (although I must say that the English is very much better than my Dutch and I admire anyone who can write in another language)

**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, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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