Reviewer's report

Title: Oncology nurses' beliefs and attitudes towards the double-check of chemotherapy medications: A cross-sectional survey study

Version: 1 Date: 22 Aug 2017

Reviewer: Ingeborg Sjetne

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper for a second time. It has improved considerably. I still find that there is room for improvement, in regard to making the paper more concise and clear.

My main objection is that it is somewhat difficult to understand the substance that the different scales and items represent. As I read the current version, it seems to me that the authors have somewhat uncritically concluded that their measurements are based on valid operationalizations of the phenomena they want to explore. The substance seems to have become taken for granted, and as a reader/outsider, I find it quite fuzzy still in this version.

Lines refer to the version with "Track changes".

Line 203, 206 mentions constructs that I would like to see presented in an explicit manner. Lines 290-291. "....a p-value <0.05 was considered significant". When this information is written in a clumsy manner, it could be read as an indication of flawed understanding. Please rewrite.

Why spurious? This is another example of the fuzziness; would you say a group-level difference in the construct or a difference in the measure/score that in this study represent the construct?
Line 436-437: To say that "Every second nurse already had experienced that, two nurses make the same mistake during double-check…" has no support in the data. According to Table 5 44.7% agreed to the statement: "F49 It happens that two persons make the same mistake during a double check (e.g., calculation error)" (also, this is results presented in the discussion section).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

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

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

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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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