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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this was an interesting and informative piece of work that has clear relevance to those providing care to patients within the hospital setting, not limited to clinicians/healthcare workers. The findings add to the dearth of research in this area.

There are some minor issues that require attention:

Background:
The UK NPSA no longer exists - suggest rephrase sentence.
Lines 83-85, 87-89, 96-97, 104-106 - authors to provide reference(s) to substantiate points made.
Lines 113-115 - sentence seems incomplete and the connection to the previous sentence is unclear.

Methods:
Lines 141-144 - authors stated they addressed several issues e.g. beliefs about safety production, limitations of DC, etc in the survey. Not clear how a survey could address these issues. Suggest authors revisit this section. Did the authors mean assessed?
Line 155 - how did the participants receive the survey? How long did they have to return the survey?

Results:
Line 188 - how was 'overwhelming' and 'strong beliefs' defined.
Line 215 - ‘except’ rather than ‘expect’?

Conclusions:
Line 307 - first sentence is redundant.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal