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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

Editor-in-Chief

Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript ID: NURS-D-18-00236))

We would like to thank you and all the reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled “Knowledge about the administration and regulation of high alert medications among nurses in Palestine: A cross-sectional study”.

We wish to thank editor and reviewers again for their time in commenting on the draft manuscript, which we believe has strengthened the paper.
Our responses to the comments are yellow and green – highlighted in the revised manuscript. We carefully addressed all the comments of the reviewers. A point by point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately addressed all comments.

We look forward to your and the reviewers’ comments on the manuscript and hope that the manuscript is given favorable consideration for publication in BMC Nursing.

Yours sincerely

Sa’ed Zyoud

*****************************************************************************

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1:

The objective of the study was to assess the level of knowledge of HAMs among nurses in government hospitals in West Bank, Palestine.

It is a well written study and follow the structures of a scientific study.

Response: We would like to say our appreciation to you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and for the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript.

In order to improve the manuscript, there are some questions and comments below:

Page 5; line 22 to 23: Why the use of 'a comparative cross-sectional design'?

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We modified it as you suggested (Page 5 Line 7)

Page, line 42 to 58: The authors should describe the methodological process used to translate and adapt the instrument 'Nurses' knowledge of HAMs' to Arabic culture.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We explained it as you suggested (Page 9 Line 12)

In the Page 11, line 32 to 35: What means "legal nurses"? It should be explained because its meaning can be different from others countries.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We explained it as you suggested (Table 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9)
Reviewer 2: Overall, the paper was well discussed and adds to the body of knowledge.

Response: We would like to say our appreciation to you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and for the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript.

I think this is more of a "cross sectional study" other than a "comparative cross-sectional study".

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We modified it as you suggested (Page 5 Line 7)

The methods section in the abstract is talking of convenient sampling but in the Methods section of the Manuscript it is not convenient sampling, needs alignment.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Page 6 Line 15)

The conclusion in the Abstract is not in sync with the topic and objectives and doesn't relate to the conclusion in the conclusion section of the manuscript, needs revision and relate the conclusion to the objectives of the study and findings.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We modified it as you suggested (Page 2 Line 27)

Under Results section, HAMs administration knowledge; present the Port A route as well.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We modified it as you suggested (Page 11 Line 20)

Maintain the same decimal places and format for the values throughout the results section.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We modified it as you suggested

In, Table 2; the "Answer T/F" seems redundant. The "Wrong/don't know (%)" is confusing suggest its separated or presented better.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We separated and presented it as you suggested (Table 2 and 3)