Peer Review Report

Review Report on Patient safety culture and safety attitudes in the Estonian context: simultaneous bilingual cultural adaptation and validation of instruments

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Maria João Lobão
Submitted on: 23 Jun 2024
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607392

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

With this study authors have validated the translation of the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (HSOPSC 2.0) andThe Safety Attitude Questionnaire (SAQ) to Estonian and Russian.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

The main strength is the methodology used. The study would benefit of more participation, although a second data collection didn't cheanged the previous findings.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

The issue addressed is of main interest in quality field and is within the scope of this journal. The translation and a validation of instruments like this are of paramount interest to enhance further investigations.
The metodology used is concise, robust and supported in good quality instruments.
I would recommend authors to revise key-words according to MesH methodology.
Please revise references according to this Journal recommendation.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

Yes,

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

No. I would recommend authors to revise key-words according to MesH methodology.

Q 6 **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

Yes.

Q 7 **Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?**

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes. Formatation according to journal guideline is advised.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	■■□□□
Q 10	Rigor	■■■■□
Q 11	Significance to the field	■■■■□
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	■■□□□
Q 13	Quality of the writing	■■■■□
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	■■■■□

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.