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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for valuable comments on our manuscript

Reviewer 1

Comment 1

In the background the authors equivocate about the effects of person-centred care in residential settings. They present PCC as if it is merely a theoretical proposition, with the use of terms such as, 'in theory', 'can enable', 'it has been suggested'.

There is a lack of reference to a number of controlled studies in which the effects of PCC were investigated.

I attach list of these studies in order that the authors can incorporate the findings of these studies into the background, and subsequently into the discussion.

While it is true that the organisational arrangements that are required to successfully implement PCC require further investigation (and thus the valid justification for the authors' current study), these studies provide sufficient evidence as the benefits of PCC.

Our response 1:

We agree that PCC is not merely a theoretical proposition, and have now included effects of PCC-intervention studies in the background. Page 4 line 18- page 5 line 2, and page 5 line 11-13.
We have also elaborated this in the discussion and more specifically discussed our result in relation to experiences from PCC intervention studies, see comment 5.

Reviewers comment 2

The description of the sample, presented on page 7, is customarily presented in the results section.

Our response 2

We have now moved description of the sample to the result section Page 10, line 15-24.

Reviewers comment 3

It is customary to report psychometric properties of instruments that were used, therefore these should be reported, especially in relation to the P-CAT, as this measure was central to the study.

Our response 3

In the method section we have included psychometric properties for the P-CAT Page 8 Line 16-18 and The DCSQ/Social support, Page 9, Line 16-17.

We have also presented Cronbach alpha-values for GRS, P-CAT and Social support subscale for this study in the Result section, Page 12, Line 3-4.

Reviewers comment 4

The citation for PASW on page 9, line 19, is incomplete as this is a registered trademark and should include a complete citation within the text.

Our response 4

We have now included a complete citation within the text, Page 10 Line 2-3.

Reviewers comment 5

Page 12, line 19, is a good example of the lack of incorporation of controlled studies (as mentioned previously in this review). The claim that 'it has reported that staff perceive…' needs
further information because resource implications of PCC have been investigated (see Chenoweth et al, 2009, 2014 on attached reference list).

Our response 5

We have elaborated this in the discussion and more specifically discussed our result in relation to experiences from PCC intervention studies, Page 13 Line 20 –Page 14 Line 5, and Page 15, Line 11-14.

Reviewers comment 6

Some discussion of the limitation of measuring staff perceptions through the use of P-CAT should be included.

Our response 6

We have included a discussion on the use of P-CAT in the discussion section; methodological considerations, Page 16, Line 3-11.

Reviewers comment 7

Grammatical errors include:

Page 4, line 13, 'regard this' should be 'regard these'.

Page 8, line 1, 'Data was' should be 'Data were'.

Page 11, line 16, should read 'size, and one staff characteristic'.

Our response 7
This has been changed as suggested.

Reviewer 2

Reviewers comment 8

Further information about the validity of the questionnaires used would have strengthened this paper.

Our response 8
In the method section we have included psychometric properties for the P-CAT, Page 8 Line 16-18 and The DCSQ/Social support, Page 9, Line 16-17.

We have also presented Cronbach alpha-values for GRS, P-CAT and Social support subscale for this study in the result Page 12, Line 3-4.

Reviewers comment 9

Another strength of this study was the engagement of the nursing homes in data collection—further information on how this was achieved would be of interest to others wishing to undertake large scale cross sectional studies in other countries.

Our response 9

We have now included some discussion about this in discussion section; methodological considerations, Page 16 Line 19 - Page 17 Line 4.

We have detected a typo in method section Page 9 Line 14: The subscale social support consists of 5 items. It should be 6 items.

This has been corrected in Page 9 Line 14