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Reviewer’s report:

Manuscript entitled „Perspectives of staff nurses about the reasons for and nature of patient-initiated call-lights: An exploratory survey study in four U.S. hospitals” re-submitted to the Journal BMC Health Services Research after considering reviewers comments

Reviewer’s general comments on the manuscript

The re-submitted manuscript has addressed most of the reviewer’s comments. Minor and major revisions have been considered and the manuscript can be accepted after minor essential revisions below.

Minor essential revisions

1. Theoretical frameworks (pg 6/7)

The earlier reviewer’s comment regarding the use of figure 1 have been addressed partially only by the author. The main information regarding National Quality Forum could be given only in the text including its relevance to call light us. For the given study, figure 2 is of major importance. I suggest skipping figure 1 and changing the sentences in the manuscript accordingly.

2. RESULTS, Call light use (pg 11)

The subtitle “Call light use” does not match the indented meaning on research question 2 (pg 7) “How many call lights per hour did a staff member respond to alone”. The subtitle should be changed e.g., to “Number of call light responses by staff”.

If available give also the (average/range) number of calls a nurse responds per shift or day, since such a number gives a rough overview of the large amount of responded calls per nurse/shift or day.

3. DISCUSSION, Patient call light use and nurse responsiveness (pg 15, lines 13/14)

Is it appropriate to mention product websites of manufacturers as an example? If this is in line with editorial policies keep it, you may consider disclosure of interest in this regard at the end of the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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