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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Dear Editor,

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments which have helped us improve our paper. You will find our responses below.

Reviewer #1:

1st comment:

A well written and designed study that builds on previous literature in this area.

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for these positive comments.

2nd comment:

It would be beneficial to include an analysis of the three profiles in relation to nurse demographics and workplaces. So, for example, were most of the nurses in the distress profile a certain age group, a certain sex, specific marital status, or work in a particular practice setting as identified in the sampling strategy. I can't see the figures so maybe that is already included in the figures.
Response: Due to ethics constraints, we were limited in the number of sociodemographic characteristics we could collect. We decided to ask for age, years of experience, shift, and educational level.

We have added two tables with the following variables variables (Table 3 ans Table 4) : Nurses' profile with age, year of experience, practice settings, shifts, and educational level.

Reviewer #2:

1st comment:

The Introduction should clearly state the objective(s) and structure of the paper.

Response: We have added a sentence at the end of the introduction to state clearly the objectives of the paper.

2nd comment:

Information is missing on the profile participants and the representativeness of the sample is not described (if we except a generic comment in the paragraph on limitations at the end)

Response: We have added a table with sociodemographic characteristics (see response to 1st reviewer).

We have added sentences to explain the representativeness of the sample.

3rd comment:

In the absence of data on the distribution of respondents by age, sex, practice area, type, size and location of facility, the analysis remains too superficial to contribute significantly to knowledge. A significant contribution would be to show which personal attributes and organizational variables explain the distribution of respondents among the three work experience types.

Response: The aim of the study was to produce profiles of nurses’ workplace experience and to describe them, which we have done by adding a table with sociodemographic characteristics. The aim of this study was not to explain or find the determinants of these profiles. This paper’s contribution is the identification of nurses’ workplace experience profiles based on the Job Demands-Resources model.

4th comment:
Out of 60 references, only 16 are from 2010 onwards. For example, the numerous publications produced by the RN4Cast project have not been reviewed.

Response: Nurses’ workplace experience is little conceptualized in the literature. Because of this, we had to go far back in time in the literature to redo this conceptualization. We wanted to produce the widest possible overview of the literature. This explains the large number of references before 2010. However, we have added a few references from RN4Cast project.

5th comment:

An editorial review is needed to make the text more fluid and reader-friendly and less repetitive in some parts.

Response: We have had the paper reviewed by a professional English-language editor.