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Dear Editor, BMC Nursing

The original manuscript *The nursing staff’s opinion of falls among older persons with dementia. A cross-sectional study* is hereby re-submitted for publication to the BMC Nursing.

Several studies have been published regarding causality and fall-preventing interventions, but there are few studies focusing on the nursing staff’s experiences with falls and fall prevention. We assume that this focus falls within the scope of BMC journal.

On behalf of the authors I confirm that the manuscript has not and will not be submitted elsewhere.

This cover letter includes comments to the reviewers. The manuscript is revised according to reviewers’ comments, and a second language correction has been carried out.

Yours sincerely,

Solveig Struksnes, corresponding author
Associate professor
Department of Health, Care and Nursing
Gjøvik University College
2819 Gjøvik
Norway

solveig.struksnes@hig.no
Phone +47 61135362

Co-authors
Associate professor Margareta Bachrach-Lindström,
Professor Marie Louise Hall-Lord
Assistant professor Randi Slaasletten
Professor Inger Johansson
Manuscript 2085083550402108 - The nursing staff’s opinion of falls among older persons with dementia. A cross-sectional study.

Comment to reviewers

Thank you for your valuable comments to the manuscript. We have made revisions according to Mr. Paquay’s comments and suggestions. Mr. Dassen’s comment is responded to in comment 8. Revisions are marked in yellow in the manuscript.

Comment 1. “The title of the manuscript”.
The authors agree, and choose to use the term “opinion”.

Comment 2. “Insufficiently explained how the nurses’ conception of caring for older persons with dementia and higher risk for falling was reduced to four areas.
The authors have made revisions to clarify this in both the background (p. 2) and in the paragraph “The questionnaire” (p. 4).

Comment 3. “Investigation of the internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) might have been part of the objectives of the study”.
Revisions have been done according to this comment. We have omitted the clarification for the Cronbach’s alpha values, as psychometric testing of the instrument was not the purpose and aim of the study.

Comment 4. “Might there have been some pressure on the nurses to participate involuntary?”
Revisions have been made, to clarify this issue (p. 6).

Comment 5. “Inconsistency between text and table 3?”
Revisions: We have tried to explain more precisely that the text and the table describe two different subgroups: staff working <5 years in the care unit in question (table) and <5 years in health care in general (not in the table only in the text) (p. 9). Revisions have also been made in the “Discussion” (p. 14).

Comment 6. “The respondents prioritized control and safety to the same degree as the resident’s freedom of movement. This statement should be supported by the result of a statistical test, not by a figure. Figures might be omitted”.
Revisions have been done, according to this comment, and the figures are omitted (p. 9).

Comment 7. “Results for Tables 3 and 4 might be documented in full text, the tables omitted”.
We think that the reviewer refers to Tables 4 and 5. According to the reviewer’s comment, we have removed Table 4 and made revisions in the text (p. 10).
We would like to keep Table 5 because of many numbers which are difficult to present only in the text.

Comment 8. “The sample is not suitable to divide in two categories of nurses. Furthermore this is not necessary.”
The authors find it relevant to present a comparison between the subgroups RNs and ENs. RNs and ENs working in nursing homes are involved in nursing care. However, they have a different education, competence and responsibilities, we therefore found it interesting to compare these groups.

We hope that our revisions have improved the manuscript sufficiently to be accepted for publication.

On behalf of the authors,
Solveig Struksnes