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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Bridget Johnston

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the thorough review and comments. Below, we provide our responses to the comments, and explanations concerning the changes made in the manuscript. Thank you for considering our revised manuscript for publication.

Editor Comments:

BMC Nursing operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Lisa Kidd (Reviewer 2): Many thanks for addressing the feedback given. I am happy that the authors have addressed these sufficiently for the most part. I only have a few comments relating to the author's revisions.

Authors: We would like to thank the reviewer for this, we appreciate that the she acknowledges our earlier revisions of this manuscript.
Comment 1: Consistency and accuracy of cross references to tables within the text needs checked - e.g. page 19 "They maintained that the implementation brought a totally different view on mobilization in daily care (Table 6)" - I believe this should be referring to Table 5?

Authors response: Indeed this has been revised and now we refer to Table 5 in the text on pg. 19.

Comment 2: Table 5 - still requires identifiers for each of the quotations to demonstrate and confirm that the responses came from the sample as a whole.

Authors response: As we conducted focus group interviews with the participants and synthesized the data based on the participants experiences, therefore we present the quotes without identifiers of the participants. We do think this is the appropriate way. If, however, we had conducted individual interviews it would have been appropriate to present the identifiers for the participants. We hope that the reviewer is satisfied with this.

Comment 3: Table 5 - I think the 'categories' in the table appear to be a description of the theme but at present a column indicating the broader theme to which the description pertains appears to be missing.

Authors response: In table 5, for both Usefulness of the guideline and the implementation part we have changed the ‘categories’ into ‘themes’. Indeed we did refer to the themes by providing somewhat broader descriptions of what we referred to as categories. Now we have changed ‘categories’ into ‘themes’ in the table and in the column themes, we only refer to the themes.

Also, we added a column for ‘descriptions’, where we provide the more broader descriptions of the themes. In line with these changes, we changed the text where we describe the themes for the results of the focus group discussion reporting on the usefulness of the SNG in the last paragraph on pg. 18, where we now describe the themes as follows: In the analysis of the focus group interviews the following six themes emerged: Improved quality of care, Content known to staff, Convenient and concise, More use of instruments, More consistency, Illustrative and instructive. The focus group interviews showed…

Further, we made changes in the text, last paragraph, pg. 19, reporting on the results of the focus group interviews on implementation of the SNG, which now shows the themes as follows: In the analysis of the focus group data, the following six themes emerged: Nursing rehabilitation defined and integrated, Physical exercise Individualized, Enhanced patient and family teaching, Coherent and consistent leadership, Improved staff education and Less visible nursing care received attention. The focus group interviews showed…

We do think that this is a more clear and thorough reporting of our findings.
Comment 4: Table 5 - The use of the quotation marks needs attention.

Authors response: We have changed the quotation marks in line with US English spelling rules.

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Authors: The manuscript had been edited by American Journal Experts.