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Reviewer's report:

The authors present the results of their survey of patient safety culture in a sample of hospitals in Kuwait. The survey is an established instrument and the analysis methods are fairly standard. This paper provides valuable information that can guide administrative policy in Kuwait, but I have several critical concerns about the transparency with which the researchers report their methods that must be addressed. The paper will also be improved with the removal of some extraneous information and more streamlined results and discussion sections.

Major comments:

Page 5-6: Please do not individually summarize all of the studies in the literature review. I would start with the Elmontsri systematic review and the other studies could be combined into a single paragraph that summarizes the most important points.

Page 7: You need to provide more information to give the reader context on how generalizable your sample is. How many total hospitals are there in Kuwait? Were the 16 you picked a convenience sample or did you randomly select them? Did you stratify by size or just note the size? Why did you exclude other types (non-public, military, etc.) hospitals? Did you intend to survey every employee that fit your criteria? How did you recruit participants? How were "selected" hospital staff (page 8 line 43) selected? How did you pick the focal people? Did focal people try to get a full census of their department or were participants selected non-randomly or randomly? Was participation voluntary or mandatory?

Page 9 line 48: I really don't understand how the remaining two outcome variables are collected and I can't figure out where they are explained. Are the composites and asked about in the survey or are they data from somewhere else - are patient safety grade and number of events reported administrative or public data? What do these measures incorporate? Is number of events normalized for the size of the hospital? If it is from your survey, how is it asked about? This is extremely opaque and the entire meaning of your management hinges on this.

Page 13 line 24-40: This paragraph doesn't make sense if the two outcomes above are from administrative data because respondents wouldn't report it?
Page 14 line 50: Report that no dimensions were worse than US or Lebanon.

Page 15-17: Your discussion section is kind of all over the place. Focus on the major contributions and findings of your study, how they relate to the literature, limitations and future work.

Page 15 line 27-45: Your study has far more limitations than you have included here, especially if, as I suspect, your hospitals and participants were not selected randomly.

Minor comments:

Page 3 line 11: missing a word after "critical" or remove "a"

Page 4 line 20: change "prominence" to "importance"

Page 4 line 28: delete have, change "theirs" to "their"

Page 4 line 42: remove italicization

Page 4 line 44: "ameliorating" probably is the wrong word here

Page 4 line 47-60: be consistent with whether or not the names of the dimensions are capitalized - you switch around in the manuscript. Also please refer to the dimension as such when you refer to it (e.g., teams performed well on the dimension of Teamwork within Units but poorly on the dimension of Non-Punitive Response to Error, etc.).

Page 4 line 60: comma needed after "survey"

Page 7 line 26: delete "it should be noted"

Page 8: line 18: Delete "Only respondents with at least one year of experience in the hospital were included in the sample" (you repeat it below in your exclusion criteria)

Page 8 line 30: . should be ,

Page 8 line 32: Why would people who no longer work at the hospital even show up in your potential sampling frame?

Page 9 line 6: add "it" after "enclose"

Page 11 line 7: reiterate response rate again

Page 11 line 20: delete "found to be", remove s from females

Page 12 line 1: others not other
Page 12 line 1-45: "90.0% percent positive" should be "90.0% positive" etc.

Page 14 line 6: report rather than demonstrate - demonstration implies something observable not perception

Page 14 line 53: Keep this legend with the appropriate graph or put it in caption so I can understand all charts by themselves without referring to the text

Page 16 line 23: grades not grade

Page 16 line 46: fewer not less

Page 16 line 39: Why is one reference in APA style?

Page 18 line 20: Add "who" after "professionals", delete "are"

Page 18 line 21: Delete permission sentence - no one is named in your acknowledgments

Page 18 line 58: Availability of data and materials refers to the raw data (the data you analyzed to generate the results). If they aren't posted somewhere online you should state that they can be obtained from the authors or that they are not publicly available, whatever the case may be.

Tables: All of your tables are named table 1 and if there are page numbers they are also 1 or not listed, which makes it hard to refer to them. They all need more detailed captions to understand components of composite score, source of outcome measures,

Tables page 1: Remind reader of overall sample size N

Tables page 1: Profession and Experience in Hospital sections are identical? Delete one of them

Tables page 5: Explain the numerical values of the scores reported so I can get a sense of the potential range (1-10? 1-5? 0-5?)

Tables page 7: don't list significance as 0.000, use <0.001, use "reference" rather than 1 for the odds ratio references

Tables page 9: Did you cluster your standard errors by hospital? Your standard errors small because they are probably wrong.

Table 6: Keep checkmark, box, X key with table. Indicate what the percents mean "percent of surveyed positively reporting…" etc.
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