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Reviewer's report:

Review: Night nursing-staff’s working experiences.

This second version is much clearer and easier for the reader to follow. The authors have situated the paper in the context of current literature and this is helpful.

1) Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question is well defined.

2) Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods sections is much improved because it is more focussed than the previous version.

Did the interview questions change over time to explore unexpected findings? It would be helpful to state if this occurred and this would also highlight the interviewer’s sensitivity to emerging findings.

In the analysis section, could the authors reference the 2nd and 3rd sentences? The fifth sentence “These meaning units ... emerged from the data” is not clear.

3) Are the data sound?
The process used to code and analyse the data is clearer (see above). My impressions are unchanged regarding the coding scheme (too coarse). However, in this version, the authors have provided the reader with sufficient detail to make their own determination.

Bottom of page 10, “For various reasons ... “, it is unclear if this is an actual study finding or part of the discussion, the authors would need to highlight what participants have said to help the reader to understand which perspective is being discussed. A back and forth in perspectives may be necessary when presenting the findings, however, the authors’ need to keep in mind the added burden on the reader.

4) Does the manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5) Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
See above.
6) Are the limitations of the work clearly stated?
This would need to be developed.

7) Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, two suggestions have been made in Question 2.

8) Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9) Is the writing acceptable?
The writing has improved since the previous version.
There are some awkward sentence structures (e.g., p. 3 2nd sentence in background; p. 4. the ability to independently and continuous analysis; p. 8 These units of meaning...; p. 18 on the top half of the page until The results of this study is difficult to follow if the authors’ are discussing their study or the results of other studies; typographical error (e.g., p. 3 background).

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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