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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

NURS-D-18-00061

Nursing students' transfer of learning outcomes from simulation-based training to clinical practice: A focus-group study

First, many thanks to the reviewers for the comments. We value, and appreciate, the comments and in the table below we give an overview of the revision made.

Editor:

1. Please ensure that your manuscript conforms to appropriate guidelines for reporting qualitative studies, found here: http://www.equator-network.org/?post_type=eq_guidelines&eq_guidelines_study_design=qualitative-research&eq_guidelines_clinical_specialty=0&eq_guidelines_report_section=0&s=

   Please include a completed checklist as an additional file with your revised manuscript.

Answer: COREQ Checklist attached.

2. Please correct the author initials in the Methods and the Authors' contributions statement.

Answer: Included.

3. In the Funding statement, please state the role of the funding body in the design and execution of the experiment, the collection and analysis of data, and the drafting of the manuscript.

Answer: Included.

Reviewer 2:
1. Is the reader to understand that the only simulation these students ever experienced while in school was this day long experience at the end of their training as they transitioned to practice? This is an important point that is left dangling with no explanation.

Answer: We agree and a revised and new text is added to the manuscript p. 4-5.

2. All simulation is not good simulation. There is no explanation of how the scenarios were actually performed, what prebriefing was used, what orientation was used if this was indeed the students first time in simulation, what debriefing method was used.

Answer: We agree and a revised and new text is added to the manuscript p. 4-5.

3. The scenarios and skills of the facilitators/debriefers are critical to the success of good simulation. This is not discussed at all, to provide context for what these self-selected students chose to report.

Answer: We agree and a revised and new text is added to the manuscript p. 4-5.

4. Simple comments - line 19- simulation is not efficient. It is expensive though. It costs more than traditional clinical and required way more planning, experienced educators who are trained in simulation and debriefing, and other resources.

Answer: We agree and the sentence has been deleted p. 2.

5. Line 59- self-confidence is notoriously not well matched with actual ability. I see you explained this in lines 261 then, but it gives me pause to see self-confidence used as an outcome measure without some objective measurements to accompany them.

Answer: We agree, and would like to use the term “expressed” as a more accurate description p. 12