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Professional’s experiences of preparing children prior to pediatric colonoscopy: an interview study

Dear Dr Honor Aronin,

Thank you for the value comments by your reviewers.

In this letter I include a point-by point response to the reviewer’s comments. I apologize for the language error, and with AJE’s help we have corrected the text as suggested. All changes have been highlighting with red colour in the manuscript.

Technical Comments:

1. On the title page, please include the email address of all authors.

It is only one author of this manuscript and adress is included

2. Please have your manuscript edited for English usage by a colleague who is fluent in English or by a professional editing service.

AJE have editing this manuscript after revision and your suggestions

3. Please add a List of abbreviations after the Conclusions section

A List of abbreviations has been added after the Conclusions section
4. After the list of abbreviations, please add the hiding “Declarations”

The hiding Declarations has been added in the manuscript after the list of abbreviations.

5. Pleas move the Declaration section from the title page to right before the hiding “References”.

The Declaration section has been moved and now reads before the hiding References.

6. Since all HCPs in this were nurses, please replace “HCP with “nurses” throughout

All “HCP” has been changed to “nurses” throughout.

7. Please change the heading “Findings” to “Results”

The heading “Findings” has been changed to Results.

8. Please ensure that your title is entered correctly in the appropriate box within the submission system

Reviewer 1:

Abstract

The abbreviation HCPs is used, but not defined

Response:

The abbreviation HCP has been changed to nurses throughout, according to suggestions from BMC technical

Introduction: The introduction is long and not clear....

Response: I agree that explanation in Introduction was not clear , and I have edited the text according to all comments from reviewer.

Introduction have been rewritten and highlighted in red in manuscript.
P4, L13-15: The meaning “previous study have shown that IBD is present in the adolescent age group in 25 percent of the cases” has been change and now reading “Previous studies have shown that IBD is present in the adolescent age group in 25 per cent of the all cases.”

Methods:

P6, L21-26: this refers to the objectives, thus should be switched in the introduction. L20-21 refers to the data analysis. Same comment. Please avoid unnecessary repetitions.

Response: L21-26 has been rewritten and now reads: This qualitative study using interviews with nurses was conducted in the Paediatric Department, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö Sweden.

P6, L32-35: "The participants consisted of 15 HCPs from South Sweden". Please be more accurate, cite the Hospital, the city, etc. Same at P6, L54-55: "at this pediatric department". Which "this"?

Response: The hospital name and department name can now read under heading Methods.

P6, L35. The author mentioned a "strategic selection" to ensure to collect a broad range of experience. What does this mean? What was strategic here? It seems the selection was completely unspecific: P7, L16: The nurses could asked for participation, if they wanted. That may lead to sort of selection bias, and explain the results regarding the fact that those who answered may not have the expected experience, or at least kind of same and comparable experience with the tasks and procedures. There was no attempt to make a more refined selection.

How was the interview built? Was it a semi-structured interview, not structured at all? How was the interview grid defined?

Response: These part has been rewritten and now reads: Purposive sampling, involving age, years in the nursing profession and years in paediatric care was applied to ensure the possibility of collecting a broad range of their experiences.

Explanation about interview can now reads: Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted in a secluded parlour at the hospital.

Data analysis. L41-42. "In order to better understand HCPs' experiences of pediatric colonoscopy" could be deleted. Please focus on the data analysis. Obviously, this is to answer the study aim.
Response: "In order to better understand HCPs' experiences of pediatric colonoscopy" has been deleted.

The description of the paragraph L41-59 is full of unnecessary details (were read and reread several times, the interview text was sorted into specific contents areas (?)), and should be more rigorous, focused on the essentials. Several details here seem to be related with the preparation of the interview grid (P8, L1-4). Please explain or order your information.

Response: The hiding Data analysis has been rewritten according to reviewer’s comments.

P6, L9-19. This paragraph is unclear. Please rewrite. What does "the credible essence of HCPs' experience" mean? Please avoid interpretations here, stay on describing the methods.

Response: The paragraph has been deleted.

The first sentence is a summary of the findings. Should be deleted here, eventually put in the discussion section.

P8, L57: What does the abbreviation "Mdn" refer to? Please use standard terminologies! Median is med.

The parts on findings are very difficult to read, and should focus on key elements. First, no summary sentence was provided on the main themes that were extracted from the interviews.

The theme entitled "Procedure similar to an assembly line" is unclear to me. To what does it refer?

The paragraph under this theme was also hard to understand. The HCP identified colonoscopy as a usual procedure performed at this (which?) department. I don't understand this as a important information ... that could be found through activity reports, no...? The overall problem here was that the context in which HCPs are working is unclear, but should have been stated somewhere at the beginning. Otherwise, why all those statements are important for the author is not obvious for the reader. If your focus is on children and colonoscopy, why talking about different degrees of medical diagnoses, and their priority, here? It is the responsibility of the researchers to focus on their goals.

Response: The context in which nurses are working has been stated and now Reading: The bowel cleansing prior to colonoscopy has been done in a paediatric department where children with various medical and surgical diagnoses are inpatient. The colonoscopy has been done at endoscopy department.

What do the "IP" at the end of citation mean?
Response: The IP means interview person

It seems that the theme 1 was based on only one citation. Please explain.

Response: Theme 1 is now theme 4 and is now based on 4 citation according review`s recomendation

What about the HCPs' perspectives according to their experience? Was there a difference. Many times the text cited the children that do not perceive what is happening (ex. P12, L42). But does this observation refer to all ages?

Response: This observation is based on nurses descriptions and refer to all ages.

It would be worth to change the order of the reporting themes. This could help to better understand the key findings.

The main information is the lack of knowledge of the illness and its symptoms from the HCP. This should be discussed first. Then the challenges surrounding information, responsibility, and the first theme.

Response: The order of the reporting themes has been change as recomended by the reviewr.

DISCUSSION.

A summary of the main findings (eg, the main themes) is missing.

P15, L23-25. "Previous research shows that the professionals and patients do not always have similar thinking about how to provide care during different procedures". Is it really on how to provide care? How could patients act on this? Please explain, or detail what you meant under "providing care".

Response: A summary of the main findings has been rewritten and I hope that is cleary now. P15, L23-25 has been rewritten and highlighted in red in manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

I struggled in places to follow the language, e.g. in the abstract conclusion, and I think the manuscript would benefit from further review of the medical English to ensure composition, word order, and grammar are clear.
There are one or two places where this may impact on interpretation, e.g. page 4, first para, is IBD in 25% of all adolescents, or those undergoing a scope? Surely not the former. Wording could be clearer here and elsewhere.

It felt like there is some mild repetition of points in the results.

The big point for me is a 'so what' i.e. what should happen next? Issues are identified, but there is little discussion of recommendations resulting from these. Concrete quality improvement points based on the findings would be helpful, perhaps in a table. What needs to happen, what could be tested, who should do it, how could it be done?

e.g. how can HCPs get more knowledge, how could cooperation be improved?

Response: The manuset has been reviewd by AJE and I hoppe that has been cleary to read and folowing the lenguige

P16, main paragraph should be rewritten to improve the clarity of the text. Some sentences like "Previous research has also shown that both children as well as their parents experience when care is not individually" missed some terms or information.

Response: Main paragraf has been rewritten to improve the clarity of the text.
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