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Author’s response to reviews:

Letter to the editors of BMC Nursing 04 July 2017

Dear editors,

Thanks for your response to our submission and your kind and helpful advices. Here goes the revised manuscript of the previous submission NURS-D-17-00002. Below we have answered to the comments and suggestions by the reviewer.

Reviewer reports:

Souraya Sidani, Ph.D (Reviewer 1): This paper reports on an implementation study, which is well conceptualized and conducted. It is guided by a well established theoretical framework. The design and methods are appropriate and enable collection of data to address the study aims. The
intervention comprises useful strategies to support staff in changing their practice. The methods are well described and justified.

It is a bit hard to follow the quantitative findings related to staff outcomes, as some include the pre and other the post intervention outcomes. It would help to clearly state the extent of change in each group; then present the results of regression whereby the post-test outcomes are the dependent variable, then those of ethnographic work.

Our answer:

We have now made clear the extent of change in each group and presented the results of regression with post-test outcomes as dependent variable. This includes making revised Figure 1 and Table 4.

Below follows text parts that have been changed in order to make it easier to follow the quantitative findings related to staff outcomes:

“In table 4 below, we report the result from a multilevel regression analysis, from the two different measurement periods (baseline and follow-up). Social background, work characteristics such as seniority, having leadership responsibility and work hours are used as explanatory variables at individual level. Furthermore, we include QPS-Nordic is as explanatory variable. The nursing homes comprise the clustering groups (level 2).

Table 4 Multilevel regression analysis using P-CAT as dependent variable.

Unstandardized coefficients with standard error in parenthesis. Data at Baseline and follow-up

(Table to be inserted)

The intra-class correlation (ICC) indicates how much of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by institutional belonging (nursing home). The ICC reveals that more than 13 % of the variation in P-CAT is explained by institutional belonging. None of the explanatory variables were significant, except for week hours per week (baseline data) and having leader responsibility (follow-up data). The percentage of leaders in the intervention group (7.37 %) responding at the follow-up is less than in the control group (13.94 %) (Chi-quadrat test p = 0.147). We did not encounter a similar difference in the baseline measurement, where the percentage of leaders in the intervention group responding was 10.56 % and 11.94 % in the control group (Chi-quadrat test p = 0.717)”. 
“In the second and fourth column of table 4, we also included the QPS-Nordic variable. The QPS-Nordic instrument contains seven dimensions concerning the staff’s perception of their leaders. When treating P-CAT as the dependent variable and QPS-Nordic as the independent variable, we find a positive and significant correlation at both baseline and follow-up. Respondents who evaluated their leaders as open and inclusive were most likely to think that their institution is committed to person-centered care.

Below is a figure that predicts the likelihood of these positive and significant correlations at baseline and follow-up respectively:

Figure 1: Adjusted predictions with 95% CIs

(Figure to be inserted)”