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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you so much for the suggestions in order to improve the article “Perceptions of Brazilian Nursing Faculty members regarding Literacy of Human Rights related to Health in Nursing Undergraduate Programs”. Please find bellow the list of changes we made considering each comment of the reviewer.

Reviewer Comments: The manuscript indicates 222 individuals completed the survey and states "(100%)" after the number, suggesting a 100% response rate to the survey. This merits explanation. A 100% response rate seems highly unusual. There is reference to using survey monkey online. For a voluntary online survey, it would be very unusual to get a 100% response rate. Thus it would help if the authors could add a brief explanation of how they achieved this or explain what they mean by the 100%.

Changes in the Article: We excluded (100%) after 222 in the abstract and results, because we did not have a 100% response rate to the survey. The idea was that the 222 individuals represented the 100% of responses we had to our survey. Thank you so much for indicating this possibility of misunderstanding.
Reviewer Comments: In the discussion, it would be worth acknowledging that while the answers to all three questions are "agree" or "totally agree" in over 80% of respondents' surveys, the percentage who responded "totally agree" declines. That is, while overall support is strong, the strength of that support changes. I think adding a sentence explaining this would be helpful.

Changes in the Article: We added a sentence with this explanation in the beginning of the discussion.

Reviewer Comments: The first sentence of the final paragraph does well to acknowledge a limitation and is responsive to a prior reviewer comment, however I think it would be better to move this statement to the discussion. It does not serve the authors well to end the article on this note and it is also written in a more absolute tone than needed. The authors could re-frame that statement to say that the study adds support for the idea that nursing faculty recognize the importance of linking health and human rights, and that it supplements other research showing the value of linking human rights to health care (with citation to other research).

Changes in the Article: We moved the sentence to the end of the discussion and also rephrased it according to the reviewer’s suggestion.

We look forward to hearing from you about the article.

Best regards.