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Dear Editor of “BMC Medical Ethics”

I am pleased to submit an original research article entitled “Factors Affecting Professional Ethics in Nursing Practice in Iran: A Qualitative Study” for publication in the “BMC Medical Ethics”. This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Leila mosallanejad, Assistant professor. Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Jahrom, Iran. Email: mosala_1@yahoo.com. Corresponding Author.

Author’s response to reviews
Response to Reviewer 1: Simon Woods
Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer’s report:
Thank you for submitting this paper, you raise some interesting issues and I believe that it is important for work of this kind coming from countries such as Iran to be published. This said there are some quite serious problems with the manuscript in its present form.

Major revisions

1. You need to seek advice from a good speaker of English with some copy editing skills
   • Done

2. You should be absolutely clear about the translation of certain concepts e.g. 'work conscience' and give an explanation of other concepts such as 'character'
   • We revised our 'work conscience' and 'character' definition with participant descriptions on page 4 and 99 to 105 line numbers.

3. You make too many rather grand claims about ethics and nursing in your introduction, I am not sure that you need them but if you feel they are necessary then you need to substantially revise your claims, explain and justify your points more clearly.
   • In the introduction Possible was corrected.

4. Your methods section needs revision, it could be shortened but it needs English revision. Also You need a better rational explaining why this study.
   • The methods section thoroughly is revised that is highlighted.

5. Your findings seem to be a rather odd collection of themes - could be improved in the light of a better methods/ rational section and you need to do much more work to explain the meaning of these concepts and draw out the
implications for practice in your discussion and conclusion.

- The findings after from reform of aims and study results accordingly with them were corrected that is highlighted.

I am sorry that this sounds rather negative but you do have interesting data and ideas.

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.

**Author’s response to reviews**

**Response to Reviewer 2: Lars Sandman**
Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal.
We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments.

**Reviewer's report:**

**Major compulsory revisions**

1. Generally the English needs improvement.
   - Done
2. Adapt the title to better reflect the content of the article – i.e. its focus on professional ethics.
   - The article title to “Factors effecting on Professional ethics in clinical practice for nursing in Iran: A Qualitative Study” was corrected and Adapt with content of the article.
3. Generally in the Background section – a better definition of professional nursing ethics is needed to enable a more clear relationship between the themes in the result section and different aspects of professional ethics.
   - in the Background section, professional nursing ethics as “Professional ethics to constitute legitimate norms or standards for governing professional behavior with respect to clients and non-clients. Most commonly, Professional ethics has addressed the obligations a profession has to the people it serves” on 2 pages and 7, 8 and 9 line is defined.
4. Line 6 – even if ethics is the foundation of nursing practice – it does not necessarily follow that ethics require more attention than other aspects of nursing care – i.e. if ethics is the foundation – it is also the foundation for all different aspects of nursing care – and how one’s attention should be prioritised is an ethical question but that does not necessarily mean that ethics in itself should
always be the centre of attention.

5. Line 8 – human rights are not necessarily cultural rights (in the sense that they are culturally dependent) – some would argue that human rights (if there is such a thing) are universal.
   - Modified
   - Modified in 9 and 10 lines.

6. Line 8 – what is it to respect behaviour? What behaviour? Is that another way to say that we should respect autonomy?
   - Modified

7. Line 13 – nursing ethics does obviously contain (or should contain) critical thinking and logical reasoning – but it needs also contain a proper set of values to be the basis of such reasoning and thinking.
   - Modified in 14, 15 and 16 lines to “nursing ethics is containing use of critical thinking and logical reasoning in clinical practice and also contain a proper set of values to be the basis of such reasoning and thinking”.

8. Line 18 – to take responsibility for the patients values might come in conflict with respecting human rights etc – see earlier in the text – i.e. the authors need to reflect over which views on nursing ethics they want to adhere to since they are not all compatible with each other.
   - Modified

9. Line 23 – do not understand the meaning of the sentence.
   - Modified

    - Modified in 26 to 32 lines.

11. Line 43 – is the aim to describe factors that affect professional ethics or how they deal with these factors – unclear! – also unclear whether it is about the exercise or development of professional ethics.
    - The study aim to “to explore and describe factors effecting on Professional ethics in clinical practice for nursing in Iran” Modified and accordingly with them result and discussion was corrected.

    - The methods section thoroughly is revised that is highlighted.

13. Result section – broad and heterogenous themes – where the connection to professional ethics is not always clear (since professional ethics have not been properly defined in the background section) - also since the result seems to bring together both what causes ethical problems with what is factors affecting good professional ethics and what could support good professional ethics – the aim and result of the study becomes complex and difficult to understand – the authors need to clarify the aim and adapt the result accordingly.
    - The result section thoroughly is revised that is highlighted and in Figure 1 Were summarized.
14. Line 96 and the first theme: no example of self-control given in the text – level of responsibility is not all about character but also about to what extent the organization makes the professional accountable, hence the theme label does not fully seem to reflect the content.
   - The example of self-control stated in 5 page and 132 to 136 lines that are highlighted. Also, theme label to “individual Character and responsibility” Modified.

15. Line 115 – example of good communication – should fit under theme 3?
   - The example of good communication fit under theme internal factors: Communication challenges.

16. Line 120 – Standards of quality is a label that does not really seem to reflect the content of the theme – which is more about organizational preconditions – i.e. it seems strange to call shortage of staff a standard of quality.
   - Standards of quality label to “organizational preconditions” label Changed.

17. Line 129 – example does not fully clarify in what sense the nurses have breached their responsibility etc.
   - Modified

18. The discussion section suffers from the same problems as the aim – i.e. is it about the factors affecting the exercise of professional ethics – or the development of professional ethics. This needs to be clarified and the article aligned to this clarification.
   - The discussion section thoroughly accordingly with modify aims and result is revised.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.