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Reviewer's report:

General comments

The article is improved after restructuring, chiefly in response to the other review, and some conceptual discussions in response to this reviewer's observations. Methods including data extraction procedures are clearer.

Minor Essential Revisions

Please check page numbers for all direct quotations e.g. this one from page 18:

Research in geriatric care [36] shows that 21% of family members with a relative in a nursing home had observed neglect “such as failure to rotate or flip this person to prevent bed sores, failure to provide a person with food, water, shelter, hygiene, medicine, comfort, or personal safety or ignoring request for help” during the preceding 12 months.

Typo at the start of the discussion:
In order to contribute to public dialogue and academic analysis.

Discretionary Revisions

[1]
"and nurses tend to report higher levels of neglectful behaviours in other nurses than themselves" (abstract p2)

This is somewhat ambiguous. I think it probably means "nurses are more likely to report instances of others' neglect rather than to self-report their own neglectful behaviour" rather than "nurses say others are generally more neglectful than themselves" which is one way it can be read; later on this is perhaps clearer in the following:

"Nurses tended to report on instances of other staff showing neglectful behaviours" (bottom page 8)

If the meaning is as I have assumed- maybe a small rewording would help clarify.

[2]
“Procedure neglect refers to objective failings in care that fall short of institutional standards” (page 13)

“Caring neglect refers to staff behaviours which lead patients, family and the public to believe that staff are unconcerned with patients’ emotional and physical wellbeing” (page 14)

This second definition, as part of the distinction between procedure and caring neglect in the centre of Fig 2, does not really distinguish this category from procedure neglect as defined above.

In the Figure, further qualification says that caring neglect falls “below the threshold of being proceduralised” and in the discussion “yet may not be quantifiable”. I think that something similar needs to be inserted after ‘staff behaviours’ in the above definition. Otherwise “staff behaviours which lead patients, family and the public to believe that staff are unconcerned with patients’ emotional and physical wellbeing” would seem to very much apply not just to lack of urgency, rudeness, etc. but to all the procedure/ objective failures as well.

[3]

I feel the discussion is somewhat light in referring the findings back to specific literature. Especially where there is reference to ‘psychology theory’ on page 25. One or two citations could also help contextualise the discussion on procedure/ caring neglect by showing how the paper has built on what has previously been reported
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