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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 comments and suggestions in our manuscript. We have modified this manuscript accordingly and details reform.

On page 5 line 12, we note the restructure of the sentence with the word 'decencies' but it remains unclear, do the authors mean 'quality?'

Response:

The word of 'decencies' was removed (P 5 line 12).

On page 6, the sample size was calculated to 'explore' a correlation, rather than assume a correlation- indeed in the end there was no statistically significant relationship. Please amend.

Response:

That’s right. It was corrected (P 6 line 13).

Reviewers were asking you to include the limitations in your discussion, it is not enough to simply say limitations have been included in a separate section earlier in the paper.
Response:

It was corrected (P 14 line 21).

Discussion: the study by Pauly should be grouped with other studies reporting moderate levels of moral distress at P12, line 14 and the rest of the discussion on lower than moderate levels of distress should follow.

Response:

It was corrected (P 12 line 5).

P12 line 14, what kind of standards is referred to here, is it standards of care, health service standards?

Response:

“Of care” was added (P 12 line 14).

The last sentence on P12 is 4 lines long, can it be made into two sentences? The next sentence should say, 'Comparing the findings........................................................... for most nurses is moderate to high.

Response:

It was corrected (P 12 line 18-23, P 13 line 1-2)

The inserted sentence in the same section on P13 is repetitive in the first sentence, suggest remove that part.

Response:

It was removed (P 13, line 1-2)

P 14, line 17 may be due to the differences

Response:

It was corrected (P 14 line 17).
P15 line 1, suggest rewrite to - A further limitation is the potential impact of confounding factors............

Response:

It was corrected (P 15 line 1).

P15 lines 2 and 3 - How would lack of readiness to complete the questionnaire affect the answers of those who did respond? Need to remove the section about cause and effect which would mean introducing the notion of experimental studies and since there was no relationship to organizational support and it may be human factors.

Response:

It was removed (P 15 line 3).

Conclusion: the first three sentences contradict statements made elsewhere in the paper, need to be consistent and know your position from here.

Response:

It was corrected (P 15 line 11-14). According to this comment, conclusion section of abstract was also corrected (P 1 line 19).

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  
E-mail: f_atashzadeh@sbmu.ac.ir