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Dear Editor,

Please find a revised, third version of the “The Professional Nurse Self-Assessment Scale: psychometric testing in Norwegian long term and home care contexts” manuscript available for your consideration. Thank you once again for your insightful comments and continued consideration of the manuscript. The manuscript has been revised in accordance with the latest suggestions and comments provided; please find our replies below (pp. 2-3).

Four authors have been involved in the completion of the manuscript, Sigrid Wangensteen (SW), Kirsti Skovdahl (KS), Lisbeth Fagerström (LF), and myself (Elisabeth Finnbakk; EF). The authorship contributions are as follows: study design EF, SW, LF; instrument development EF, SW, KS, LF; data collection EF; analysis EF, SW, LF; and manuscript preparation EF, SW, KS, LF. The manuscript has not been previously published. All authors meet the criteria for authorship and have approved the final manuscript. Lastly, we the authors declare no competing interests.

We hope that you find our third version of the manuscript suitable for publication; the corresponding author, Elisabeth Finnbakk, can organize payment by credit card as necessary. Thank you again for your interest and help in this endeavor, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Elisabeth Finnbakk, Corresponding author
Lovisenberg Diaconal University College
Lovisenbergt. 15 b
0456 Oslo
Norway

E-mail: elisabeth.finnbakk@ldh.no
Mobile phone: +47 975 444 09
The following revisions have been made in accordance with the latest suggestions and comments

1. The title has been changed.

2. General changes have been made in relation to those portions of the text marked with red “overstrike”:
   - p. 2, lines 3-7
   - p. 3, line 6
   - p. 4, lines 8, 14
   - p. 5, lines 1-2
   - p. 6, lines 3, 8, 9-10, 18, 23
   - p. 7, lines 2, 4, 10, 13-15, 20-21
   - p. 8, lines 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19
   - p. 9, lines 11, 12, 13, 17-22, 23
   - p. 10, lines 5, 7, 11, 17
   - p. 11, lines 4, 5, 8-9
   - p. 13, line 13
   - p. 15, lines 1, 21
   - p. 16, lines 1, 13, 15, 20, 22
   - p. 17, lines 15, 22
   - p. 18, lines 15, 16
   - p. 20, line 12.

3. We maintain that the lack of an instrument for the self-assessment of nurses’ clinical competence at different educational levels and across specialties and countries is of importance and have sought to clarify this viewpoint (p. 2, lines 4-5 and p. 6, lines 13-14).

4. We have changed the text to more closely reflect the changes made to the title (p. 2, lines 7-8 and p. 6, lines 19-20).

5. We have reworded in regard to the two data collection regions (p. 2, lines 12, 15; p. 10, lines 12-15; p. 12, lines 17-18).

6. We have removed content related to developed instruments being based on national requirements (p. 6, line 9).

7. We have reformulated to ensure readability and paragraph flow and in an attempt to eliminate wordiness (p. 7, lines 13-15; p. 8 lines 3-4; p. 9, lines 1-13, 17-20).

8. Heading has been changed according to your recommendations (p. 8, line 7 and p. 9, line 15).

9. In regard to the specific queries about the collection of sample and data:
   a. How were those 357 selected out of 704?!!
      The N=704 was the total possible number of RNs working in the eight municipalities. While all 704 RNs were invited to participate in the study, only 371 questionnaires were returned (i.e. response rate 52.7). Fourteen of the 371 questionnaires were rejected due to questionnaires with $\geq$ 26 items not answered ($>$ 35%), resulting in 357 respondents.
   b. How did you secure representation of all geographic areas and type of units?
Nurses responded from all eight municipalities included in the study, thus all geographic areas are represented in the sample.

10. The content of the “Data analysis” section has been shortened (p. 10, line 23 and p. 12, line 6).

11. In regard to the specific query about the “Confusion between eligible (704) and sample (357)?”. The text has been reformulated to provide added clarity (p. 9, lines 17-20, p. 12, line 23 and p. 13, lines 1-2).

12. The direct questions related to items have been changed to italic style (p. 14, lines 17-18, p. 17, lines 20, 23-25 and p. 18, lines 1-2).