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Dear Dr. Clare Partridge,

I am the corresponding author of the manuscript titled "Cross-sectional study on pedagogical strategies in nursing education: how improving effective pedagogy?". We submitted the manuscript by online submission on February 15th, 2015. After received the comments from the referees we revised our manuscript and we addressed the comments as below:

1. “There a number of issues because the article has been probably translated from Italian to English”:

   we revised every sentence to detect language issues e we correct them with the supervision of a mother tongue.

2. “The background is not completely well developed. Some statements have not justified by the literature (i.e. pag 4 raw 10, ...they must also care for patients with multiple chronic pathologies in settings often lacking adequate safety measures...) and they seems like only personal opinion”

   We revised the background and we indicated bibliography sources related to individual statements.

3. “The method is well explained, although there is a need of clarification about the sample (it is not completely clear if the "teachers"(faculty) interviewed are nurses or not - please modify at least table n. 2 with more clear indication)”

   we explained better in the text that only nurses constituted our sample.

4. “About the questionnaire (pag. 9) there are not clear indications relating the development of this instrument also in terms structure of the questionnaire (n. item, element of likert scale, sociodemographic data ) At same time, does not appear clearly explained the Cronbach Alpha value and factor analysis data used for validation.”

   we explained in the text the development of the tool indicating number of items for each section, what were the elements of the scale. We explained better in the text how we calculated Cronbach Alpha value and factor analysis and we added a new table to summarize their values.

5. “The discussion is not completely well developed”

   We developed better this section and we used a proper linguistic form.

6. “The limitations of the work are not clearly stated in the article”:
We added a clear section in the discussion to speak about the limitations of the study

7. “The title do not reflect, at least overall, the content of the article.”

we changed the title as suggested

Thank you for receiving our manuscript and considering it for publication. We appreciate your time and look forward to your response.

Sincerely yours,
Nicola Pagnucci

Nicola Pagnucci, RN, MSN, PhD student
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