

Author's response to reviews

Title: New quality regulations versus established nursing home practice-a qualitative study

Authors:

Anne Marie Sandvoll (annemsa@hisf.no)
Kjell Kristoffersen (kjell.kristoffersen@uia.no)
Solveig Hauge (solveig.hauge@hit.no)

Version: 2 **Date:** 4 May 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over

Dr Tom Rowles
Executive Editor
BMC Nursing
Førde, 4 May 2012

Dear Dr Rowles

Thank you for your valuable comments and reviews of our manuscript “New quality regulations facing the established nursing home practice- an ethnography” (revised title: “New quality regulations versus established nursing home practice: a qualitative study”).

We have considered the reviewers’ comments and we are pleased to resubmit a revised article with the following changes (marked in red), made point-by-point according to the referees’ suggestions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Please reconsider your interpretation of your results. Your major findings “Significance of daily routines” and staff “always knowing what to do” seem to infer that the nursing staff ignore residents’ rights to plan their everyday life in the nursing home. The field notes shared in the manuscript appear to differ. Also on p. 10 (sixth paragraph under The significance of daily routines) the authors note that when staff falls short in their schedule, it is their break that gets cut short.

Later on p. 10, (second paragraph under Always knowing what to do) the authors note that “for residents who are able to say what they want, many minor requests were met..” then on p. 11 (fifth paragraph under Always knowing what to do) the authors’ field notes state,” It’s because we know them very well,... every resident has things they like or not, and many of them like to have routines.”

We have considered our interpretation of our major findings and changed “Significance of daily routines” to “Commitment to daily routines”, and changed “Always knowing what to do” to “We just know”. Further, we have tried to explain more explicitly that the nursing home staff meet residents’ rights to plan their day-to-day life, despite not being aware of the new regulations. This is also discussed in the Discussion section.

3. The authors found that the staff members had little knowledge about new regulations and that it is unclear why. One explanation you pose on p. 13 (Discussion second paragraph) makes sense and conclude: “Thus, in a way, the staff were meeting..” What do you mean by “in a way?”

This sentence was unclear, and has now been changed to “This might explain why the staff were able to meet...”.

4. On p. 15 the authors state that, “it appears that habitus and routines form a powerful team that new regulations are unable to overcome.” Was there a need in this situation to overcome them?

No, there was no need to overcome them. Therefore, we have removed that part of the sentence.

5. (Discussion fourth paragraph) In the first full paragraph in What can we learn from our findings on p. 15, the authors note that in the specific nursing homes they studied evidence existed that good care was provided but went on to generalize that change was needed to improve quality of care in nursing homes. What evidence was this observation based upon? **Because of lack of evidence, we have removed this sentence.**

6. In the section, What can we learn from our findings, third paragraph on p. 16 in the discussion about changing habits, actions were proposed in order to share new values. There is an implication that “old” values were bad. The discussion makes it appear staff actions were bad or insufficient for quality care and that may not be the case and could cause demoralized staff. The problem, in short, appears more nuanced than the authors’ discussion.

We agree that this was unclear. The main point here was to explain the need to consider staff’s habits when implementing new regulations. We have now tried to express this point more clearly.

7. Under Strengths and Limitations section, the authors’ rightly note that the data were based on the observations of one person and earlier in the paper the authors’ noted that this researcher became more practiced and comfortable in the second nursing home than the first one. **(A)** Did this process affect data and their interpretation? **(B)** The assumption seems to be that automatic is bad and mindfulness is needed all the time, but is that true? **(C)** The authors should discuss what staff should do in situations where residents cannot (for whatever reason) state their desires or participate in decision making.

A. This process probably affected the interpretation of the data, and was not expressed clearly in the manuscript. We have now explained the interpretation process more precisely in the Strengths and Limitations section.

B. We agree that this was unclear in the manuscript. We have now tried to express more clearly that experience in interviewing is important so the interviewer is able to do what is needed at the right moment, without an explicit plan (under Measures taken to ensure trustworthiness).

C. We realise that our findings were unclear when discussing residents who were unable to state their wishes. We have now made this more explicit in the Results section, under “We just know”.

8. The concluding statements imply that working to regulation (it is not clear how regulation is evaluated as good or bad and does not spawn unintended consequences) improves the quality of care but they authors did not provide evidence to support it.

Because of lack of evidence, we have removed this statement.

Minor essential changes □

1. The title doesn’t seem to reflect the paper’s content:

What does “facing” mean? Would it be better to use the words: “versus” or “confronting”?

We agree that the title was unclear and it has now been changed to “New regulations versus established nursing home practice: a qualitative study”.

2. Context third paragraph: p. 5 poor health or increasing dependency instead of saying “bad” health?

We have changed “bad health” to “poor health”.

3. Data collection, second paragraph: 6 change “new” with “knew”

“Knew” has been inserted.

4. Data collection, third paragraph: p. 6 either expand or delete the sentence about government papers collected for analysis. It didn’t seem to manner to the conduct of the study or its discussion.

The sentence has been deleted.

5. Measures taken to ensure trustworthiness second paragraph: p. 8 paragraph before Ethics section. It seems out of place and may fit better in the Discussion.

The paragraph has been deleted.

6. Results, first paragraph: p. 8 consider adding the word “direct” between little and influence in the sentence that states: Therefore the regulations had little influence on the staff’s work.”

“Direct” has been inserted.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published.

The manuscript has been copyedited to improve the style of written English, by Online English <https://www.oleng.com.au/>

According to your recommendations, we have:

- included the title page in the manuscript
- provided the name of the ethics committee
- included the competing interest statement
- included the authors’ contributions section

Yours sincerely,

Anne Marie Sandvoll

Anne Marie Sandvoll

Solveig Hauge

Solveig Hauge

Kjell Kristoffersen