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Reviewer's report:

The authors have diligently replied to earlier comments and the text is much improved. I suggested that the authors include the information sheet as an appendix. They have included in their revised submission as a supplementary document. The editors will decide whether this should be included as an appendix. If it is, it should be provided in English, as the current copy is in Korean, so the content cannot be assessed.

I have 11 suggestions for further amendments to improve the paper, as below.

1. Page 3

Line 26: nursing informatics competency, which refers to the ability to perform nursing tasks and roles related to informatics activities, is one of the fundamental competencies demanded of nurses

Please delete 'nursing' before informatics, as nursing informatics as a competency is not likely to be demanded of any profession other than nursing, so the word is superfluous

2. Lines 33-35:

The sentence Developing curricula and continuous training in the field are essential to improve nurses' informatics competencies repeats the phrase used twice in the preceding sentence. I suggest either merging the two sentences or shortening the sentence to 'This requires improvement though new curricula and continuous training in clinical settings'.

3. Page 4

Lines 17-18- please indicate in which country the Quality and Safety Education for Nurses project took place
4. Page 5-6

Recruitment of participants:

The sentence 'Considering the appropriate sample size, questionnaires were distributed to 300 individuals' is followed by

'Participants were recruited through advertisements and approached by survey assistants. The assistants provided a hard copy with information about the purpose and aim of the study'

Please provide a description of the procedure for recruitment, including information on the content of the advertisements (as appendices), where they were placed, and whether the survey assistants contacted students who did not approach the study team first to express interest. If the students were contacted by the team in the first instance, please indicate clearly as to whether approval was obtained from the ethics committee for the study team to have the contact details of the students (e.g. the lecturers involved in the study were also involved in their education, had access to their personal details and had approval to use them for this purpose).

5. Please also include information on the numbers of students who contacted the team to express interest, if this was a part of the process. If it was, how many of these were not contacted in order to get the sample size of 300?

Page 14

6. Please introduce a separate sub-heading for 'Limitations'.

Please sure that this section relates to limitations only, and does not combine ideas for future research. Currently the 4 limitations identified (of which only 3 seem valid) are followed by a sentence to say that the limitation could be rectified by future studies- this is not a good way in which to present an insightful critique of one's own work.

7. Lines 13-14: I'm not sure what is mean by evaluating the effectiveness of the measure. It is not an intervention, so evaluating the effectiveness is not an appropriate description. Accuracy and reliability of the measure and generalisability of the findings can be strengthened in future studies. If something different is meant here, please explain
8. Line 18: please rephrase this sentence 'And the lack of a stability test for K-SANICS (test-retest) is a study limit' to for example 'We have identified the lack of a stability test in the form of test-retest as the third limitation of our study'.

9. Line 42: The authors indicate that the measure has limitations 'despite some limitations, the K-Sanics…' however the preceding section related to study limitations, not limitations of the measure. These are different. If the measure has limitations, please ensure that these are identified separately to the study limitations. If the authors mean that the study has limitations please rephrase e.g. 'Despite the limitations of this study, we believe that the K-Sanics could be useful…'

10. Lines 56-57 'With the changes in information technology in the healthcare system, nursing informatics competency has now become a fundamental ability demanded of nurses. This repeats almost verbatim the Line 26 on page 3. If the authors retain the sentence, please ensure that they refer to the sentence that is used earlier on, so that it doesn't seem to the reader that they have simply forgotten it and are repeating themselves by mistake. If retained, please subject to the same modification as in my earlier comment.

It would be preferable to delete the sentence however.

11. Similarly the next sentence 'The Korean version of SANICS comprises 30 items across six factors and is a reliable and valid tool for nursing students' contributes nothing to the conclusion as it is a repetition of earlier text.
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