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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers

Dear Editor-in-Chief and Reviewers,

The paper NURS-D-19-00140” How do we use the time?” – an observational study measuring the task time distribution of nurses in psychiatric care, has now been amended using track changes in accordance with the reviewers valuable comments. We have tried to make the amendments as succinct as possible. We hope this is acceptable and that our amendments have increased our chances for a possible publication in BMC Nursing. Our amendments are as follows: Thank you for allowing this possibility to improve our manuscript!

Reviewer 1.

Abstract.
Line 11-12, page 1. Data analysis method information added.
Line 17-21, page 1-2. Rewording of Conclusion according to suggestion.

Background.
The background has undergone a thorough revision in accordance with the reviewer's comments.

Methods.

Discussion.
Line 267. Line 2,72 page 15. Removed a sentence that couldn’t be properly referenced.
Line 257-258, page 13. It was a deliberate move that only 30% of the observations were carried out during evening shifts since this reflects a common working schedule for nurses at this clinic. This has been clarified in the Results section.

Conclusions.


References.

DOI numbers added to references.

Reviewer 2.

Abstract.
Line 4-5. Line 4-5, page 1. Tried to improve upon awkward sentence.
Line 12. Line 12, page 1. Deleted part of sentence according to strikethrough.

Background.

The background has undergone a thorough revision in accordance with the reviewer's comments.

Methods.


Line 197. Line 200, page 11. Added citation regarding consistency in observed data.


Results.


Discussion.

Line 267-268. Line 272, page 15. Removed a sentence that couldn’t be properly referenced.

Line 269-270. Line 274-276, page 15-16. Added citations where qualitative literature shows that patients desire more time with the nurses to build relationships.


Line 299. Addressed in the background.

Line 312-314, 327, 329. Line 317-349, page 18-19. Although the Benner reference is older, it is still an influential text regarding nursing expertise, and is still commonly cited in journals. The paragraph is updated to reflect this but also with further, more recent literature. Thank you for the provided papers!


Conclusions.

Line 389. Line 407-409, page 22. Quantified the difference compared to other studies.


Line 393-394 Line 410-411, page 22. See previous definition.


Line 405-408. Line 426-432, page 23. Elaborated in the conclusion about time spent on direct care.