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October 17, 2019

Dear Dr. Wenru Wang, Editor, BMC Nursing

Thank you for the thoughtful review of our manuscript and the opportunity to respond to the reviewers comments. We are pleased that the reviewers feel that our paper addresses important issues and we hope we have adequately addressed each reviewer’s concerns in a satisfactory manner. Corrections to our manuscript have been made and are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer reports:
(Reviewer 1):

1) The manuscript failed to describe for setting up the research panel from which how many members included in the research team for monitoring the entire research process.
   • I have not seen this type of request before and am unclear what information is being asked to be included in the manuscript. The research team involved myself and another professor, and then we had a research nurse who conducted the interviews.

2) The author violated "the policy of blanket anonymization". It was evidenced in the line 147 that the names of some research members (Thompson and McClement) disclosed in the data analysis to reviewers.
   • My apologies for this oversight. It is removed now.

3) The format of all quotes was seen an unclear source. For example, in the line 176 [HCA04], it only indicated the quote coming from the participant [HCA04], but it did not show which part of the transcription. It is recommended to write like this: for example, [HCA04: 17], [HCA04: 17], the number of 17 after the colon punctuation mark indicated the source is coming from the 17th conversation record of the HCA04's transcription.
   • We have gone ahead and formatted the quote sources as recommended by the reviewer.
4) No stringent proofreading was seen before submitting the manuscript. The reason is that typo error of “combining” was found in the line 282. It should be combing instead of combining.
• This single typo has been corrected.

(Reviewer 2):
In manuscript queries found, under Methods
1. When was data collected?
• Dates have now been added to the first line of the methods section (between January 2014 and March 2015) (line 85).

2. Which Sampling method was used? Why? You must explain
• While we did not name the specific type of sampling used, we felt we gave a fairly length description of our sampling method. This was a two phased process, whereby colleagues nominated who they perceived as experts and then those nominated experts were invited to participate. In this way, I guess you could label it as purposive and have stated this explicitly (line 93).

3. Semi-structured interview – the question was asked on how the form was developed and the supporting literature.
• Thank you for this question and I think what the reviewer is asking is how did our semi-structured interview guide come to be developed. Unlike quantitative survey development which requires adherence to a rigorous process of testing and validation prior to use, the qualitative interview guide can be (but necessarily) grounded in theory or research literature. We asked ‘grand tour’ questions that would elicit the experience of providing care to those dying with dementia. For example, questions such as “Tell me about what it is like to care for a dying person with advance dementia on your unit?”; “Could you describe for me what the last few months of life look like for a person dying with advance dementia?”; Can you recount an encounter with a dying resident with AD and/or his/her family in which things did not go as smoothly as planned?”; were asked to get a broad perspective. Therefore it is difficult to specifically identify research literature in which these questions are based on. We are open to how the reviewer and/or editor would like us to address this in the manuscript.

4. Which Data analysis method was used? Why? You must explain
• We did describe the data analysis method (constant comparison content analysis) and the rationale is provided in the paper description (lines 137-148).