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Philippa Harris, PhD

Executive Editor

BMC-series Journals

BioMed Central

Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road

London, WC1X 8HL

Dear Philippa Harris,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise my manuscript and improve it based on the reviewer’s comments and suggestions. I found both reviewers comments and suggestions helpful in pushing me to generate a better paper for publication. I have revised my manuscript largely based on Reviewer One’s comments as requested by you in the previous email. Below is a point-by-point response in how I addressed Reviewer’s One concerns:

Point One: “paper is too long”.

• I have substantially shortened the paper and condensed my literature review. Pages 10-12 I address the literature, however, I am less descriptive and draw on Chopoorian’s reconceptualization of the environment as an example of how we in nursing might also re-conceptualize vulnerability.

Point Two: “too much description of what this author or that author says in her or his paper, often not that related to the main points made in the current paper”.

•...
• By drawing more on Chopoorian and Steven’s reconceptualizations of environment, I am able to address Reviewer’s One’s concern about too much description and move my argument to a stronger place. Pages 13 and 14 describe how Chopoorian and Stevens called for more critical conceptualizations of environment in nursing, so must we readdress the concept of vulnerability. I outline how the use of critical social theory, which is in line with the critique by nursing scholars in Latin America, we can broaden the conceptualization of vulnerability to a structural level. It is in this broadened conceptualization that I have strengthened my argument and become less descriptive.

Point Three: “too many detailed quotes”.

• By paring down the section that overviews historical depictions of vulnerability in nursing I have eliminated detailed quotes and concentrated more on my argument rather than emphasizes individual author’s takes on vulnerability.

I trust that the revisions have adequately addressed reviewer ones comments and concerns and therefore have resulted in a stronger paper.

Sincerely,

Laura Tomm-Bonde, MN, NP (F), PhD (c)

School of Nursing, University of Victoria

Email: Lntomm@uvic.ca
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