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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer's report on revised manuscript

As indicated in my initial review this is an interesting and timely article extending the work of the lead author, who has published previously on the topic of implicit rationing of nursing care.

Major Compulsory Revisions

There were no major revisions required.

Minor Essential Revisions

Initial review:
1. Background section, paragraph 2, lines 11/12, sentence commencing “The effect of the work environment on rationing...”

the phrase ”..supporting that antecedents of missed care exist..” is unclear and potentially confusing. I recommend some rephrasing to clarify the point being made.

Revision review: this is now expressed more clearly. I am satisfied with the revision.

Initial review:
2. Statistical analysis section, paragraph 2 (final paragraph in this section). line 4 from end of section:

“... BERNCA score were recorded into 6 levels...”

The authors need to explain why and perhaps more importantly how this was done, in order for the reader to understand how the levels were generated. From my perspective this is the most substantive revision required to the manuscript. Without an understanding of the decisions made on this issue, it is difficult to really determine the actual relevance / robustness of the defined thresholds.

Revision review: The revised manuscript is now clear on this issue. There is a small typo in this revision, line 2. The word “negative” should read “negatively”

Discretionary Revisions (minor issues not for publication)

Initial review:
1. Review of the literature, paragraph 1, line 4 - I recommend changing the word “supporting” to “suggesting”
Revision review: wording has been changed as recommended

Initial review
2. Review of the literature, paragraph 7 (the 3 lines immediately above the heading Purpose), sentence commencing “However, both studies investigated satisfaction...”
This point could be stated more clearly.
Revision review: This point is now more clearly expressed.
Initial review

3. Results section, paragraph two (immediately beneath insertion order for table 1) I recommend adjusting the text of Aim 1 to read as follows:
Aim 1: Relationship between patient satisfaction with rationing of nursing care and work environment ...
Revision review: revision appropriate.
Initial review

4. Results section, paragraph 4, line 3 the phrase “...slightly less frequently than rarely.”
This seems a very counter-intuitive way to express this point. Rephrasing may aid understanding.
Revision review: Point is now more clearly expressed.
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