Author's response to reviews

Title: Mothers’ Experiences in the Nurse-Family Partnership Program: A Qualitative Case Study

Authors:

Christine M Kurtz Landy (kurtzlc@yorku.ca)
Susan M Jack (jacksm@mcmaster.ca)
Olive Wahoush (wahousho@mcmaster.ca)
Debbie Sheehan (debbie_sheehan@sfu.ca)
Harriet L MacMillan (macmilnh@mcmaster.ca)

Version: 4 Date: 29 August 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
August 29, 2012

Dr Christopher Morrey
Journal Editorial Office
BioMed Central

Dear Dr Morrey,

Re. 1819105319665096  Mothers’ Experiences in the Nurse-Family Partnership Program: A Qualitative Case Study

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for re-reviewing our manuscript. We have addressed the minor revisions recommended by the reviewers as described below. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Christine Kurtz Landy

Christine Kurtz Landy, RN, PhD
Assistant Professor, School of Nursing
Minor Essential Revisions

1. The number of mothers participating in the second interview and those that didn't and the reasons why they didn't do not add up to the correct number of participants on page 10. On page 27 the numbers appear correct. We have corrected the error regarding the number of mothers participating in the second interview on page 10 as follows:

“While all of these mothers consented to complete the second interview, only seven of the original 18 mothers were interviewed with four (previously five) refusing because they were too busy; two mothers no longer had custody of their infants and did not want to be interviewed, one moved and four were lost to follow-up at the time of the second interview.”

2. The authors should be encouraged to use a consistent style for presentation of quotes to assist readability. In particular, on page 21 there are very long quotes included in the text (though quotes of similar length are indented elsewhere in the paper). Page 21: I believe the first 2 long quotes should be blocked, like many of the others.

As recommended we have indented (blocked) and single spaced the very long quotes on page 21 in order to be consistent throughout the paper.

3. On page 5 the authors review some studies of experiences and perceptions of home visiting by nurses. In the following paragraph they then review studies of the NFP, stating that there are no published studies examining experiences of mothers in the NFP. This is a very nuanced distinction and should be made even more explicit. They are evaluating an NFP program, whereas other studies were studying nurse home visiting, but not necessarily NFP.

As recommended we have made our statement more explicit re the lack of research on experiences of mothers in the NFP program.

“Although several studies have examined and demonstrated the effectiveness of the NFP program, no published research was found that specifically examined the experiences of mothers participating in this nurse home visiting program.”

4. Top of page 10: it is not clear who completes the coding of the interviews. They describe double coding for the first 10 interviews, but unclear what happens after that for the remaining 8.

We have included the following statement at the top of page 10: ]]. “The researcher CKL coded all of the interviews”.

5. Discretionary Revisions

At times the discussion appears somewhat repetitive. The authors should be encouraged to ‘tighten’ the writing where possible.

We have tightened the writing in the discussion section.