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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor in Chief Panayota Sourtzi, and highly esteemed reviewers 2 and 3,

We would like to start by thanking the reviewers for their constructive and useful comments. Their engagement and valuable comments together with yet another language editing has hopefully improved our paper entitled ‘Registered Nurses Experiences of Managing Depressive Symptoms at Elderly Care Clinics: A Qualitative Descriptive Study’ (NURS-D-19-00103R1). All amendments are highlighted in yellow. Please note that approximately a further 500 words is now taken out. We sincerely hope that our second round of amendments have increased our possibilities to be accepted for publication in BMC Nursing. Our amendments are as follows:

Reviewer 2 [MLB]:

Thank you for the thoroughness of the article revisions. The revisions have greatly enhanced the clarity of the paper's message and improved readability. This is an important study that highlights the realities of depression in older people and the challenges faced by the nurses that care for them. It has the potential to support further innovations in older adult dementia care practices and future research.

• Once again thank you for your relevant and valuable comments and your kind words acknowledging our amendments.
#1) There are two small typos that I noted. 1) page 18, line 11, "Ns" should be "RNs", 2) page 19, line 47, there needs to be a full stop at the end of the first sentence in the paragraph after '...competence. Nevertheless....'

- Typos corrected, once again thank you.

Reviewer 3 [EK]:

#1) Introduction: 1st line: "Depressive symptoms and depression are among the most common mental disorders in older people". Among what? I do not quite understand this. Among means together with something.

- Thank you for your comment, please kindly note that the word among have more meanings in English than between or together with something; it can also be read as ‘depressiva symptom och depression är bland de mest vanliga…’. Thus, we would highly apricate if the sentence can remain as stated as among is a vital part what we wish to stress.

#2) 5th and 6th line: "However, it is not…", "the ability to treat it successfully…” What it the "it"? Depression?

- Sentence amended for clarity

#3) Depressive symptoms? Line 31: "Registered nurses (RN) work closely with patients." That is obvious, but do you mean here patients in general or older people as clients?

- Sentence amended for clarity.

The introduction is informative. However, registered nurses' tasks and roles at these CCOPs could have been explained more detailed. Are there other health care professionals involved at all? Also, are there any research done about other perspectives, such as patients'/clients'' experiences of CCOPs that you could refer?

- Amendments are done where possible to increase clarity in regards to the above. However, it is important to clarify that our focus in the manuscript is RNs experiences. No general information beyond the one already stated on page 4, second and third paragraph as well as on page 5, first paragraph can be offered in the manuscript. As stated on page 5 last line first paragraph, the majority of them are under development hence the activities (tasks) of the RNs on this centre is not yet well described or settled in. Their role is to lead the center’s in accordance
with the focus of the accreditation given to them (page 4 second paragraph). To our knowledge this is the first paper looking into this therefore no peer-reviewed papers have been identified in our searches preceding this paper about RNs or about older people’s perspective of this type of health care services.

#4) Design and methodology: What kind of interviews were conducted? Structured? Semi-structured? Open?
• We conducted interviews in accordance with our reference [17], thus, we used one overarching interview question as well as probing to support participants to elaborate on their answers (please see page 5 first four lines under the heading ‘Data collection’ for this information)

#5) Did you use any theoretical or philosophical framework to guide your work? For example, phenomenology?
• Thank you for your question, no as we have conducted a qualitative descriptive study (please see page 4 under heading ‘Design and methodology’). This design is described in the method literature (for example by Sandelowski [69] to not depart from any particular philosophical or theoretical perspective as the classical qualitative designs is described to do.

#6) Data collection: Where and with whom the central question was pilot tested?
• Clarified on page 5 under the heading ‘Data collection’

#7) Data analysis: You mention Elo & Kyngäs earlier in the text but not here in the data analysis section.
• Elo and Kyngäs [18] is, besides being mentioned on page 4 under the heading ‘Design and Methodology’ also mentioned twice under the heading data analysis, we have however added the reference a third time for clarification under this heading.

#8) You should refer to the analysis stages here.
• Under the heading ‘Data analysis’ five iterative stages are described; naïve reading; locating meaning units, condensation and coding; interpretation and identifying similarities and differences; sorting into subthemes; interpretation of subthemes and identifying themes.

We hope that, particularly considering the critic in our first amendments in regards to the length of the paper that this description can be judged as relevant. If not, we are happy to reconsider. We have however amended to clarify these five steps

#9) Could you also consider adding a figure to illustrate your analysis, themes and subthemes?
• Please see new table 1 enclosed.

#10) Results: The results chapter is quite long. The amount of quotations could be considered to be decreased. Now it is a bit difficult to catch the point.
• Thank you, but please note, result is re-written in accordance with the relevant comments given by reviewer 1 and 2 at R1, that is our initial major revision of this manuscript. However, to honor your additional comment, even if contradictory to R1, this part is carefully gone through to ensure clarity while still honoring the valuable input from the reviewers at R1. Text are taken out from this part and other amendments are highlighted in yellow. We sincerely hope that you will find this acceptable, if not we are happy to reconsider our reply to you.

#11) Discussion: You could start the discussion by repeating the main results/themes after the aim.

The discussion is quite long. However, your discussion is relevant but a bit illogical.
• Thank you for interesting reflection. First part of discussion amended. Please note this section is already considerable shortened and re-written in accordance with the comments given in R1. Regardless, we have gone through the discussion again to make sure that it is clear and concise while still in accordance with the input at R1. Text are taken out from this part and other amendments are highlighted in yellow. We sincerely hope that you will find this acceptable, if not we are happy to reconsider.

#12) Methodological considerations: You discuss about the trustworthiness of the study. How about the generalizability and usefulness of the results? In addition, what are the strengths of this study?
Thank you for valuable comment, under the heading methodological considerations, the results transferability and conformability are discussed where the first can be said to be fairly comparable to generalizability. We have amended the section in accordance with the above and hope this can viewed as acceptable.

#13) Other comments: The language is still a bit unclear here and there in the text.

Language undergone editing, but to not confuse intellectual revisions with language and form these are not highlighted in yellow.