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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor of Journal of BMC Nursing

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate the very useful reviewers comments and suggestions in our manuscript. We have modified this manuscript accordingly and details reform listed below in the following order:

Reviewer: 1 (Virginia Plummer)

The term 'ethically annoying' implies a diminished responsibility to ethical considerations for practice and research by nurses, please reconsider the use of this term.

Response:

The term of challenging was used instead of annoying (P1 line 5).

P3 line 1, reduce the use of phrases such as 'it should be pointed out'. The authors just make the statements they need to make. The first sentence on this page could be deleted, it contributes little. Provide examples of ethically complex situations, but they may not be complex for all nurses, as ethical dilemmas are individual.

Response:

The relevant paragraph was removed (P3 line 22).
P4 line 15 what are decencies in the education system?

Response:
It was corrected (P5 line 13).

P4 line 21 remove (the) Iranian

Response:
That’s right, word of (the) was removed (P5 line 19).

P5 Methods: how were nurses selected? Or were they all invited?

Response:
The first and last sentence on that paragraph were written (P6 line 6, 9, 12).

P5 line 13 10%

Response:
It was corrected (P6 line 20).

The reason for selecting the setting of ICU is not clear.

Response:
Our apologies for this mistake. The setting of this research was several wards, not Just ICU. It was written incorrectly (P7 line 1).

The reason for selecting the instruments is not clear.

Response:
It was added (P7 line 14-16 & 19).

P7 Results: the demographic data could be reported with one decimal place.
Response:

It was corrected (P8 line 14).

Was there only one dimension for perceived organizational support?

Response:

There was only one dimension for perceived organizational support (P7 line 14).

P values are reported in lower case

Response:

P values are reported in lowercase.

Conclusion: includes concepts not previously discussed such as ethical leadership style and friendly relations- the conclusion needs to be redrafted in light of the revised discussion and concepts related to the findings.

Response:

The conclusion was revised (P15).

Limitations of the study need to be discussed in the Discussion

Response:

Limitations were added (P14 line 22).

Discussion: the discussion of the results and location in the literature does not seem to have been fully immersed in the critical care/ICU literature, especially when there is such literature available. It seems of little values to make comparisons with the hotel industry (ref 45) general nurses (44, 47) and emergency nurses (49) and mental health nurses (53) and not discuss the differences.

Response:

In this study, samples included nurses from all wards. Ref 45 were deleted because it was related to hotel industry.
P9 line 15: The conclusion drawn here should be modified, the relationship between paying attention to staff and moral and work conflicts was not tested. 'Attention' can be paid in many ways, and may or may not be related to support in this area.

Response:
This paragraph was modified (P11 line 19).

P9 Line 20: should read. Also Cummings...

Response:
It was corrected (P12 line 3).

P10, Line 14: in the Iranian context, for example...

Response:
Details were added (P12 line 20).

P11- line 18: after decision made to use the instrument, why on reflection, was it not the best instrument and why was this not clear before commencing the study?

Response:
This statement was quoted from Maningo-Salinas study (ref 15). It was moved to another place (P13 line 16-20).

P11: Mandatory repeat studies, implies that it is compulsory because the researchers did not make good design decisions for the first study. How could an ethics committee be certain of beneficence in follow up studies?

Response:
Word of “necessary” was used instead of “mandatory” (P13 line 18).

Why is this statement related to original work referenced?

Response:
This statement was quoted from Maningo-Salinas study (ref 15). It was moved to another place (P13 line 16-20).

P12: the last line of the discussion needs rethinking- the paper has not described frequencies of confrontation.

Response:

It was deleted (P14 line 18).

Reviewer: 2 (Georgios Efstathiou)

Please review your aim. I believe that your manuscript deals with much more than the relationship between perceived organizational factors and moral distress (e.g. demographics). I suggest to focus on your aim or change it to reflect the content of the manuscript (results and discussion parts)

Response:

It was modified as per your comment. However, the relationship between demographic variables of nurses with these two main variables has been reported as other findings and is not the main purpose of the study (P1 line 7, P6 line 1).

Abstract: please check your statement (line 42) on no statistical relationship. Numbers in brackets show the opposite (compare with table 2).

Response:

It was corrected (P1 line 17).

Abstract: conclusion part does not reflect the findings since there is no relationship between organizational support and moral distress. The same applies for the conclusion part of the main text. In other words, in my opinion, suggestions made are not supported by your findings

Response:

It was modified (P1 line 18).

Methods: how did you decide that 120 nurses were enough for your study? Did you perform any tests e.g. power analysis?
Response:

The sample size formula and related description were added (P6 line 13-19).

Methods: you say that nurses needed to have one year of experience in ICU. This limits the generalization of your finding and needs to be addressed as a limitation. I also suggest to include this in the title (nurses working in ICU). Was your study conducted among nurses working in ICU or nurses who had experience in ICU (but may now work in other department)? Please clarify why you chose ICU.

Response:

In this study, samples included nurses from each wards. The study inclusion criteria included at least one year of work experience, which, unfortunately, was typed mistake that was corrected (P7 line 1).

Data collection tools: please explain how the SPOS works (e.g. the higher the mean value the...).

Response:

Details were added (P7 line 12-14).

Data collection tools: I suggest to move the reliability tests (Cronbach's alpha) in the results section.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. We appreciate your comment. We preferred to use in the section. Most of the article published in this journal are presented in this section.

Table 1: you do not need to use the plus/minus symbol when you refer to SD

Response:

It was deleted (table 2).

Table 2: please check the p and r values (last cell), there is inconsistency with what is reported in the abstract

Response:

It was corrected (table 3).
Page 8: first line, please rephrase since it causes confusion on what is related with what.

Response:

It was corrected (P10 line 3).

Discussion: The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between two variables. However, a large part of discussion deals with this 2 variables separately and only a small part deals with their relationship. I suggest that discussion should be rewritten, focusing on the aims of the study

Response:

The aim was modified. It seems that this problem has been resolved by changing the aim.

Conclusions: please focus on the aims of the study but also on the findings and conclude based on them and not based on your personal beliefs

Response:

Changes were made in the conclusion section.

Reviewer: 3 (Faraz Ahmed)

-------- [Abstract]--------

(1) Please alter wording (pg 1, line 5); "ethically annoying conditions" is a loaded term, I suggest ethically challenging conditions.

Response:

The term of “challenging” was used instead of “annoying” (P1 line 5).

(2) Please check the following line (p1, line14-16), I believe you are referring to P=0.86 and not r=0.86: "Moreover, Statistical analysis showed no significant relationship between perceived organizational support and moral distress (P=0.01, r=0.86).”

Response:
It was corrected (P1 line 17).

------- [Background] -------

(3) Again, please alter wording (pg, line 1); "ethically annoying conditions" is a loaded term, I suggest ethically challenging conditions.

Response:

It was corrected. Of course, this paragraph was deleted (According to suggestion of reviewer 1)

------- [Research design] -------

(4) Please fix grammar in Research design paragraph (pg 5, line 10-13), also % sign location is causing confusion (i.e. %10, 120 -> 10,120% or 10% ; 120)

Response:

It was corrected (P6 line 20).

------- [Data collection tools] -------

(5) The authors need to specify the key limitation of the tools used. Either in this section, or I suggested a paragraph (sub-section heading) in the Discussions sections that details the overall limitation of the study.

Response:

Details were added (P14 line 21).

------- [Results] -------

(6) Table 2 on page 7 - please fix capitalisation for one of the variable (e.g. Errors and Total moral distress, should be "r", not R)

Response:

It was corrected (table 3).
(7) Table 3 on page 8 - please fix capitalisation for one of the variable (i.e. Errors, should be "r", not R)

Response:

It was corrected (table 4).

-------- [Discussion] --------

(8) Limitation section: I suggested having a sub-section (limitation in the discussion). For instance, limitations concerning ii) tools used, ii) how the sample mix may have affected the findings, and iii) as well as acknowledging that study was conducted at one point in time.

Response:

That’s right, Details were added (P14 line 21).

-------- [Other discretionary changes] --------

(9) Please change the terminology in some place (i.e. avoid the use of subject as a term to refer to participants): [pg 5, line 12]; [pg 6, line 16]; and [pg 14, line 12].

Response:

It was corrected.

(10) The authors detail some of the key demographics connected to the participants (i.e. pg 7, line 2-8). A table with the profile of participants, in addition to the text already in this section, may illustrate to key difference/details to the readers better.

Response:

It was added (P8 table 1).

All the changes are highlighted by using the track changes mode in MS Word. The manuscript has been resubmitted to your journal. We look forward to your positive response.

Regards,
Dr. Foroozan Atashzadeh –Shoorideh,  
Associate Professor, Department of Nursing Management, Nursing & Midwifery School, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran  
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