



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_19499
Title of the Manuscript:	Hospital Patient Safety Culture in Developing Countries: A Comparative Study in Ilam City, Iran
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Unfortunately it was extremely hard to review the manuscript due to poor and not understandable English. Phrasing is odd and words are misused, generally it seems when as translated missing the spirit of English language.</p> <p>Sampling is not well described. It is not clear are 250 beds in each hospital or in all four together. In order to understand sample we need to know total number of all employees participating in health care process.</p> <p>Authors state it is available sample, what does it mean in this circumstances. If only small number of staff agreed to participate in the study this must be regarded in the discussion when explaining contribution of this study.</p> <p>Table 1. Is incomplete and not understandable, it would be better to change frequency with number (N), percentage of what?</p> <p>Results are also poorly presented. Tables 2-4 are incomplete and not clear. Title of table 2: Not clear maybe due to poor translation from original language to English. Who are replants?</p> <p>It should be stated that results relate to all four hospitals.</p> <p>Table 7 last line it is stated TOTAL &MEAN, not</p>	<p>The manuscript has been grammatically revised.</p> <p>As seen in the MS (please refer to section methods), the capacity of all the hospitals was 250 beds.</p> <p>Total number of employees (physicians, nurses, midwives and paramedics (radiology and laboratory staff)) was introduced in the MS.</p> <p>Available sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher.</p> <p>Tables of 1 and 2 were combined as one table. Tables 3 and 4, tables 5 and 6 were also combined as two separate tables.</p> <p>The content of the tables was modified accordingly.</p> <p>The word of TOTAL was deleted in the table (please refer to table 4).</p> <p>As introduced under table 4, Benchmark</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>clear mean of what, also % of what ? Table 7,8 if you are comparing to „benchmark“ you must define it, I could not find it in the text. Table 9. not understandable. Mean of what?</p>	<p>indicates the mean of the patient safety culture score in the USA hospitals that is annually conducted by AHRQ. Therefore, the data obtained in 2014 was used as benchmark in our study.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>It is better to avoid indicating tables in the discussion. Benchmark is mentioned but again there is no reference related to it. Discussion should be adjusted to the results, and possible effects of not representative sample should be explained.</p> <p>Abstract: study design and setting should be rewritten</p>	<p>As seen, the reference 20 was used to Benchmark. The discussion was presented according to the results. The study design and setting should be rewritten. The References were updated.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Generally I feel that experts from developing countries should be given a chance to publish their results, even when those results are not well presented. Their work is valuable and data seems to have potential, but someone need to help them in better presenting their results, as well as rewriting the manuscript with help of native speaker of professional in the field of English language. References are up to date.</p>	