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Author’s response to reviews:


Dear Editor!

Thank you for the thorough review of our manuscript entitled ‘Thriving at work in nursing homes: meanings of working in a person-centred way (Manuscript ID: NURS-D-19-00123). We have revised the manuscript based on reviewers’ comments, and hope that the revised version will be reconsidered for publication.

Please find below a structured outline of editor and reviewer comments and our responses to these. Red font has been used to indicate the revised portions of text within the manuscript. It is hereby acknowledged that all authors are in agreement with the changes made.

On behalf of the authors,

Best regards,

Tove Karin Vassbø

Editor Comments:
1. Additional work to ensure compliance with COREQ standards for conduct and reporting of qualitative research. In particular, please address items: 8 (characteristics about the interview - and clarify does "senior researcher" page 5 line 39 refer to first author, and was the first author involved in all interviews, or was at least A senior researcher / author involved in all interviews; 20 (field notes); 27 (use of software), 28 (feedback on coding), 29 (use of participant IDs/codes on direct quotes).

Response and changes in the paper:

In compliance with the COREQ standards for conduct and reporting of qualitative research, information of senior researcher / author involvement in the interviews has now been included under the heading ‘Interviews’ in the revised manuscript.

Furthermore, as suggested in accordance with the COREQ standard item 20 (field notes); item 27 (use of software), item 28 (feedback on coding), and item 29 (use of participant IDs/codes on direct quotes) has now been accounted for under the heading ‘Interviews’ in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 5 and 6

Page 8 – 12 (ID-codes).

2. as per BMC guidelines, can the title to the paper be 'tweaked' to clarify the study design?

Response and changes in the paper:

As suggested, the title has now been changed to include the study design in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Title page

3. Can the discussion be modified to clarify to what extent do the authors feel that the study findings were influenced by the intervention study documented in citation 29.

Response and changes in the paper:

Your question is very relevant and has generated great reflective discussions in the research group, thank you for this.

You are right that the concept of thriving was in the aim of the intervention, together with providing person-centred care.
However, in our preunderstanding, thriving was ‘limited’ related to the thriving of residents, and we initiated the project with the hypothesis that if staff provided more person-centred care as a result of the intervention, this would then translate to increased thriving in residents. Regarding staff, we hypothesised that providing increasingly person-centred care would translate to increased job satisfaction.

We were quite surprised from the interviews to realise that staff also described experiences related to thriving in themselves, thus starting to realise that the concept and theory of thriving may have relevance also to care staff. This was not something we expected, anticipated or set out to explore. It is true that we were highly sensitised to the concept of thriving, but with the preunderstanding very much being that this was a resident-oriented concept. Thus, our preunderstanding of the concept thriving for care staff was very limited, and we became surprised but analytically interested when starting to realise from the interview content that this could be a very relevant theoretical lens also to interpret staff related wellbeing at work.

Hopefully this can contribute to explain our thoughts on how our preunderstanding of the concept of thriving influenced the analysis.

To accommodate your comment, we have now added text at the end of ‘Background’, and in the chapter ‘Analysis and interpretation’ and modified the discussion by linguistic changes to clarify that the thriving concept arises from the data material. Besides, we have added text answering this comment under the headline ‘Strengths and limitations’.

Page:

Page 4, and 12 – 16.

4. p.4 line 14 - the hypothesis includes "thriving among residents", yet the residents' voices are not recorded in this study. Should this be added as a limitation?

Response and changes in the paper:

We appreciate this comment. The hypothesis is related to the main study and this article reports from a sub-study focusing on staff’s experiences. Hence, we do not see it as a limitation in this study. However, we can see there is a likelihood that such misunderstanding could occur. Therefore, we have made changes in the revised manuscript to help the readers to better understand the relationship. A further clarification of this issue has now been added in the background (last paragraph) in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 4

5. p.14 line 41 "access to a much richer material than the authors could collect" - does this mean that the authors would not have been able to collect the data without the involvement of local project managers?
Response and changes in the paper:

We profoundly apologise for this misleading statement. This sentence has been removed in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1

6. On the top of page 5 you describe how the participants were recruited. Were there not any other inclusions criteria than the willingness to be interviewed (such as having taken part in the intervention, having worked in the profession and/or at the current workplace for a minimum amount of time)? Could you please describe the recruitment process in some more detail? For example, did the head of each nursing home asked specific employees if they would be willing to participate or were all asked?

Response and changes in the paper:

The recruitment process has now been described in more detail in the revised manuscript. We have also added the following inclusion criterion: having worked at least one month in the nursing home during the intervention period (criterion to be included in the main study).

Page:

Page 5

7. I have not myself conducted a phenomenological-hermeneutical analysis and my question might be a result of that. I wonder about the relation between sub-themes and themes. My understanding is that themes are an abstraction of the subthemes. However, in your case I cannot see that the second theme (Being part of...) is an abstraction of the subthemes, it is more like that the sub-themes have been put together, one after another. What are your thoughts on this?

Response and changes in the paper:

Thank you for this comment. We intended to be in line with what Lindseth and Nordberg suggested: seeing the theme as ‘a thread of meaning’, and to capture the meaning of lived experience ‘not formulate the themes as abstract concepts, but rather as condensed descriptions’. However, in line with your appropriate comment, we have now renamed the second theme (Meeting shared goals in collaborative teams) to be more in line with the first theme, in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Abstract,

page 7, 9, 12 and
Table 1

8. You write that working in a person-centred way can be interpreted as thriving at work. As far as I understand the present study is part of an intervention study that aimed at promoting person-centred care and thriving in nursing homes.

In what way did the fact that thriving was part of the bigger project guide the present study when it came to interview questions and the data analysis?

For example, in the phase of naïve reading where I understand that pre-understanding of the topic is a part, how did your pre-understanding of the concept of thriving and the fact that thriving is part of the overall project influence the analysis?

Response and changes in the paper:

Thank you for these essential comments. A revision in line with your comments will improve the manuscript.

For further response, please see response to editor Comments number 3.

Page:

Page 4, and 12 – 16.

Reviewer 2

9. Abstract - line 3 should this be meaning rather than meanings?

Response and changes in the paper:

As suggested, the word ‘meanings’ have now been replaced by the word ‘meaning’ in the abstract.

Page:

Abstract

10. line 8 understanding of what attracts them to this work and support further development of person-centred care practice in nursing homes - What work? is it nursing home work or working in a person-centred way.

Response and changes in the paper:

As commented, the sentence containing the term ‘this work’ has now been changed in the revised manuscript.
Page:

Abstract

11. line 39 change information sharing to sharing information

Response and changes in the paper:

Due to the revision, the suggested change in line 39, have now been deleted in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Abstract

12. line 4/542 it seems reasonable ??? Why does it seem reasonable is there evidence to support this claim?

Response and changes in the paper:

We regret that this wording seemed vague and lacked substantiation. To be more precise, the formulation of the conclusion has now been moderated in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Abstract

13. Background - line 44 change create to creating

Response and changes in the paper:

As suggested, ‘create’ has now been changed to ‘creating’ in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 3

14. *lines 45-49 A person-centred climate consists of a holistic experience of the organisation, the physical and psychosocial environment and human interactions...For who??

*line 49 It is an integral part of enabling person-centred care...... What is an integral part of enabling PCC??

*line 51 when you say climate do you mean culture? It might be worth explaining that climate and culture are the same if not please explain what climate is
Response and changes in the paper:

Thank you for the request to clarify the concept of 'person-centred climate' further, and to make clear the difference from the concept 'culture'.

As three comments address the background and explanation for the concept 'person-centred climate', we have chosen to make the changes and account for the changes as a whole.

The text section has now been changed to clarify 'for whom' and what we meant by an 'integrated part', as well as, as suggested, explained the difference between the concept’s climate and culture in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 3 and 4

15. page 4 line 1 More recently, a study [28] focusing on advantages from working..... change from to of

Response and changes in the paper:

As suggested, the word ‘from’ has now been changed to ‘of’ in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 4

16. line 7 I don't believe the research into staff’s experience of working in person-centred care cultures in nursing homes is sparse. There is lots of recent published studies on both residents and staff’s experiences

Response and changes in the paper:

We apologies for the somewhat erroneous wording used. The text has now been moderated in the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 4

17. Interviews - Line 24 sounds awkward can you amend please

Response and changes in the paper:

As suggested, the changes have been corrected in the revised manuscript.
Page: 

Page 5 

18. Line 26 To further deepen may be better is written as To gain a deeper understanding and to clarify

Response and changes in the paper:
As suggested, the changes have been corrected in the revised manuscript.

Page: 

Page 5 

19. Line 31 after person-centred way? remove "and" insert ? after what are your experiences?

Response and changes in the paper:
As suggested, the changes have been corrected in the revised manuscript.

Page: 

Page 6 

20. Page 6 line 32 Here, the themes were summarized and reflected on concerning the study aim and the contexts of the study, taking into consideration the naive reading, the structural analysis, researchers' pre-understandings and theory relevant for what the interpretation opened for. This is a long and awkward sentence can you rephrase please?

Response and changes in the paper:
As suggested, the long and awkward sentence has now been rephrased and divided into two sentences in the revised manuscript.

Page: 

Page 7 

21. Page 9 line 22 Some days we can reach no matter what, without being stressed. This does not make sense perhaps this is a translation it needs to be checked for readability line 39 change unformal to informal

Response and changes in the paper:
We thank you for this opportunity to improve the readability of this translation. As suggested, we have re-translated the text. The improved translation has now been added to the revised manuscript.

Page:

Page 10

22. Discussion - page 12 Thus, the results indicate that task focusing is an essential and integral part of the learning process. I am unsure how this relates to person-centred care. Most person-centred care models would state that the focus should be on the person not the tasks and therefore stating that that task focusing is an essential and integral part of the learning process is both misleading and incorrect in terms of person-centred care.

Response and changes in the paper:

Thank you for this critical and relevant comment. The indicated tension between person-centred care and the model of thriving at work have now been further discussed and argued for in the revised manuscript. We have made explicit how Spreitzer et al (2005) describe ‘task focus’ in their model and emphasised how their description differs from how ‘task focus’ as opposed to ‘person-centred care” according to most person-centred care models.
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Page 13