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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for an interesting manuscript, it contains useful content. Manuscript adds to the international literature on ensuring patient safety. However, there are some issues to be considered, that might improve the manuscript further.

In the Background section bottom up approach is described on page 4, lines 25-52. Nurse-physician collaboration satisfaction is only one aspect of a bottom up approach, what should be later in manuscript emphasized (when describing and justifying a measure of organizational bottom-up approach on page 7, line 38-40 and mentioned in Discussion section).

In the Methods section, Study design and participants, the research environment should be fully described more clearly and in detail. E.g. How many hospitals were invited? How many units and also nursing employees have 7 hospitals included in the research? How were respondents selected? Which units were included? Were same units in different hospitals included?

Why it took almost a year to conduct a survey, from November 2012 to December 2013? Who and how distributed the questionnaires (envelopes, boxes… to ensure anonymity), was the same process of survey distribution used in each hospital?

In Method section, Outcome measures, p. 7 lines 2-5, authors report about internal consistency. I assume authors used Cronbach's alpha to calculate internal consistency, although not stating this in this section. If yes, Cronbach alpha was .62 in this study. What was the cut off, as usually Cronbach's alpha above .70 is acceptable? A comment about Cronbach's value should be included in Limitation section. Method of calculating internal consistency and cut-offs should also be mentioned in Data analysis section.

P. 7, lines 24-31, authors explains calculating the scores in the instrument. Is this supported by the literature? If yes, reference should be included.

P. 7, line 45, authors describes evaluating content validity. Why did the authors include only 2 experts? Is this supported by the literature? Were content validity indices calculated? If there were some limitations in the process of evaluating content validity, this should be included in Limitation section as well. Same comment for page 8, line 11 - MAE instrument was also
evaluated by content validity by research team. How many experts were included in this research team?

Page 8, lines 12-22, original 16-item MAEs instrument has four dimensions. Some other authors (e.g. Hogan, 2006 and Chiang and Pepper, 2006) who used same instrument found three dimensions. Did authors check construct validity and perform FA? If not, why? This should be also then discussed in Limitation section.

In Method section, Ethical consideration, why only one hospital included in research approved this study by institutional review board? Authors should explain why this is acceptable.

Page 10, lines 1-7, correlations are statistically significant, however correlation coefficients were weak, what should be therefore explained in the Discussion section, where authors state for example (p. 12, line 8), better knowledge about medication administration was correlated with lower disagreement over medication errors. All bivariate correlations were weak.

Discussion section. P. 11, line 14-15 authors are stating that nurses with a master's degree perceived lower barriers, what is true, however, only 3 participants had master's degrees. Strong conclusion and a comment regarding sample should be included.

Clear implications for practice, policy and future research presented in Discussion could enhance the message of this research.

Manuscript style and format is generally acceptable, but some copy editing is needed.
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