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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

The authors conducted a baseline assessment of patient safety culture in public hospitals in Kuwait using the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (HSOPSC). This study is not novel, but merits investigation in the context of Kuwait. The sample size used is very large and will likely result in findings that are representative of healthcare professionals and other patient safety stakeholders/advocates in Kuwait. However, I noted that the sample is biased towards nurses with only a few pharmacists. The grammar and scientific writing skills are good, but require significant improvement in several palaces. I suggest that the paper should undergo language editing by credible services such as Wiley Editing Service or similar. In addition, I have some concerns regarding the statistical analyses utilized and will equally advise that an experienced biostatistician review these aspects. Overall, the paper can be reconsidered should the authors be prepared to undertake revisions.

Abstract

- Fairly well-written, but can be better. There are too many individual studies reviewed and cited, but not in any logical sequence.

Background

- Fairly well-written, but can be better. There are too many individual studies reviewed and cited, but not in any logical sequence.

- The study rationale and justification are unclear. This casts some doubts in the reader on why it is important to conduct the study in Kuwait or at least why did the authors conducted the study. This has to be made clear.

- The term "patient safety culture" was initially abbreviated as PSC, but the authors keep using both inconsistently throughout the manuscript.
What do the authors mean by ameliorating PSC? I thought they should be aiming to cultivate it. Please use a more appropriate term.

Cite those multiple studies.

Objectives

Can be better stated to comply with the principles of SMART objectives. In addition, there is need to mention the targeted population (i.e. among who was the study conducted).

Methods

The Methods section needs significant restructuring and improvement in terms of content and structure.

The section "Design, setting and sampling" should be split to several important elements of methodology. Example, each of the 3 should stand on its own. However, the different elements of the methodology should be organized in a logical manner such as: (1) Study design; (2) Setting; (3) Population and sample; (4) sample size and sampling; (5) Study instrument; (6) Data collection procedures; (7) Ethical approval etc.

The authors should describe how sample size was estimated/calculated and how the respondents were sampled (i.e. sampling technique). There is mention of clinician and non-clinician staff which really look awkward to me. Any health professional such as nurses, physicians, and pharmacists are considered clinicians in the modern world.

The authors failed to explain how and why they selected the 16 hospitals, the 12871 respondents. Why not 20 hospitals and 10,000 participants? How were they selected?

The investigators mentioned that they adopted a customized version of the HSOPSC developed by the AHRQ. Please indicate/cite the reference for the adaptation.

Page 9, line 45 - 47: What is the difference between "frequency of events reported" and "number of events reported" as outcome variables?

Data management and analysis: Overall, I suggest be reviewed by an experienced statistician. But, I doubt if ANOVA f-test is the appropriate test to examine the association between the
two outcome variables (patient safety grade and the number of events reported) with the remaining patient safety culture composites.

- Benchmarking: I am unclear about the benchmarking done by the authors using some mathematical equations. Is this a standard norm?

Results

- This section needs significant overhaul. The section is not written at an international standard of scientific writing.

- How did you determine 70% or higher to be areas of strength etc. Any reference to support this notion?

- Table 1 has not been cited within the text.

- Page 13, paragraph 2 requires improvement and rewriting as you can see from my comments below.

- Page 13, line 24 - 26: Respondents holding a university degree were less likely to report better patient safety grade compared to who?

- Page 13, para 2, line 26 - 30: Physicians, pharmacists, nurses and administrative staff, all had lower odds of reporting higher number of events compared to who?

- Page 13, para 2: "Kuwaiti nationals were had lower odds of reporting better patient safety grade but higher odds of reporting higher number of events." Correct grammatical error (e.g. were had). Also, higher odds compared to who?

- Page 13, para 3: "The Linear regression analysis below....." What do you mean by below? I did not see the regression below.

- There is generally unnecessary use of capitalizations throughout the manuscript (e.g. in describing the 12 dimensions/constructs of the HSOPSC).
Tables

- There is miss-labeling of tables. For example, Table 1 to Table 5 are all labelled as Table 1. I am not sure why.

References

- There are many errors throughout the reference list. All journal names are not written according to the BMC style.
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