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For the attention of the editorial board of BCM Medical Education

Thank you very much for your mail and comments. We have made the changes that you requested and we are sending you the modified article. The methodology followed in the investigation is consistent with the guidelines Qualitative research review – RATS, and we have made this clear in the first paragraph of the Method section in the article, in accordance with your instructions.

The following are the changes that you have requested and that we have addressed.

**In relation to the changes proposed by the reviewer: Luke Reid:**

In reference to point 1: “The title of the study could be worded better, as ‘of experienced nurses in critical care’ could have multiple meanings”

- We changed a bit the title in the line that you suggested.

In reference to point 2: “Authors should think about addressing the limitations of the study.”

- We have made the changes in the line that you suggested. The limits of the study are discussed in the final section of the methodology.

**In relation to the changes proposed by the reviewer: Justine Aka**

In reference to point 1: Discretionary Revisions:

“The inclusion of nurses was based on two criteria: ‘the experience of nurses in numbers of years, and recognition of good practice by their colleagues. How wasthe latter identified/defined?’

- We have made the changes in the line that you suggested.

“You data was interpreted by “three researchers with experience in qualitative research. You also mentioned an audit by other researchers. What does this mean?”

- We have made the changes in the line that you suggested. We have deleted “with experience in qualitative research” for not considering it relevant.

“You have stated your opening question of the interview which is very broad and open. More specifics on what happened thereafter would be useful for replication of your research. Were there any particular key words or questions you used to guide the interviewee? How was the interview recorded?”

- We have made the changes in the line that you suggested.

In reference to point 2: Minor Essential Revisions

“The background could be a little more specific on what is meant with practical knowledge in the nursing profession. Inclusion of more literature would possibly help clarification, as well. For example, have other studies elaborated on the practical knowledge in other fields? This could
be either in other fields of the nursing profession, or allied health professions. Emotional and intuitive knowledge was mentioned for the first time in the discussion part of the paper. Mentioning this in the introduction as well, might give a better insight into the subject you researched in to”

• We have made the changes in the line that you suggested. The main references to respond to these questions are the studies of Schön (in different professions) and Claxton (in the field of education).

“Reference to the table is missing in the results part. • In the results part you state that “overall the nurses with the most years of experience in the critical patient care in the ICU have developed a […] knowledge that is shown in their detailed description that they give of their everyday practice.” More specific please. What does “most years of experience” mean? How many years?”

• We have made the changes in the line that you suggested.

“Abstract and main paper are not coherent. For example, results in the abstract include a part on components of caretaking that guarantee success. These results have not been mentioned in the results part of the main paper. Also, the concluding points differ.”

• We have made some the changes in the line that you suggested.

In reference to point 3: Major Compulsory Revisions

“Language needs to be reviewed! Some parts of this work are written very complicated with too many words; sentences could be shortened and parts expressed more clearly and specific in other words”

• We have made some the changes in the line that you suggested.

The main research question or hypotheses are not stated.

• We have made the changes in the line that you suggested.

“Many of the single statements from the interview have been generalised in the results and discussion of this paper. This is not correct, it has to be clarified how many nurses have found a certain aspect to be important, adding the years of experience this nurse has. Include the numbers. Sample size is too small to generalize your findings for a whole population of nurses”

• We have made the changes to generalize in the line that you suggested.

“Limitations are missing”

• The limits of the study are discussed in the final section of the methodology.

“Instead of using a BBC resource, try to find the scientific paper the journalist was referring to! (Reference 53).”
• We have made the changes in the line that you suggested.

Yours sincerely,

Maria Sagrario Acebedo-Urdiales