

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

This paper was submitted to a another journal from BMJ but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Open.

(This paper received three reviews from its previous journal but only two reviewers agreed to published their review.)

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Nursing students' experiences with faculty incivility in a clinical education context: A qualitative systematic review and meta-synthesis
AUTHORS	Zhu, Zheng; Xing, Weijie; Lizarondo, Lucylynn; Guo, Mengdi; Hu, Yan

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Valentina Bressan Udine University, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear authors thank you for the opportunity to read this manuscript. The topic of this paper includes interesting and relevant information for nurse educators and clinical nurses but I would suggest you to introduce some minor revisions of the manuscript as identified below.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>In the objective section authors declared that they conducted a synthesis of quantitative evidence but this is a systematic review of qualitative studies. I think that the term “quantitative” might be a mix up word, and for this reason I suggest to remove the term as already done in the manuscript (line 109)</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>In this section authors declared they used meta-aggregation approach and followed ENTRQ statement. In my opinion the table reported in appendix 1 is very useful for the readers, however the ENTRQ in section 2 “Synthesis methodology” suggests to describe the rationale for choice of methodology, I therefore suggest to the authors to add a brief explanation to clarify why they adopted the meta-aggregation approach.</p> <p>Confidence in the findings</p> <p>Pages 7-8 from line 179 to line 191: The sentences here are not very clear, the concepts reported here are clear but the way they are written is a little bit confusing, and I therefore suggest to review and simplify them.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Page 16, from line 436 to 438: the authors declared as follows: “This finding added to our knowledge that nursing students regarded instructors acted without professionalism as incivility to them, which was different form the faculty-to faculty incivility”. Please add a reference to support this statement</p>
-------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Page 17, from line 454 to 456 the authors reported as follows: “Universities and hospitals have an ethical mandate to ensure nursing students, and preceptors, are practicing in areas that don’t negatively influence student health and help students to form professionalism”. I agree with the authors even if I suggest them to add a reference to better support the sentence.</p> <p>Page 17, line 459 and line 464 the authors started the sentences as follows :“previous studies.....” “some studies believed....”.</p> <p>Please add some references to support these statements.</p> <p>Page 17, lines 478- 479 “the consequences of overload and unmanaged stress are the dance of civility”, considering the meaning of the sentence maybe the authors meant to say the dance of “incivility”, and not “civility”.</p> <p>Finally, as a last comment it is suggested to review the English because in the text there are several linguistic inaccuracies</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Carmen Wing Han Chan CUHK, Hong Kong
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Sep-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Nursing students’ experiences with faculty incivility in clinical education context: A qualitative systematic review and meta-synthesis</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to review the paper. It is a comprehensive systematic review of nursing students’ experiences with faculty incivility in clinical education context using the meta-synthesis method.</p> <p>Abstract A well-organized and clear abstract. A typo was found in the Objective “...synthesize the quantitative evidence” should be “...qualitative evidence”.</p> <p>Introduction A clear and coherent introduction is presented.</p> <p>Methods Line 136 Please include more search terms such as P.I.C.O. Line 144 A brief description of the JBI tool is needed here. Line 145 What is the rate of disagreement? Line 163 What does it mean by stating “highest level” of credibility. How many levels are there?</p> <p>Results The third paragraph “Quality assessment” is better to be placed before the paragraph “Study description” for the sake of logic and the order of tables since Table 2 was stated before Table 1 in the current manuscript. Inconsistent initials (uppercase and lowercase letters) were found in Table 3. Line 340 The sentence “Three subthemes were categorized including negative coping, positive coping, and seeding the future.” seems to be inconsistent with Table 3 and the statements in the manuscript. If I understand it correctly, there are only negative and positive copings in the synthesized findings. Please clarify that.</p> <p>Discussion A detailed and comprehensive discussion is provided.</p> <p>All in all, the topic is interesting and I would like to see it published after minor revisions.</p>
-------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1#:

1. Dear authors thank you for the opportunity to read this manuscript. The topic of this paper includes interesting and relevant information for nurse educators and clinical nurses but I would suggest you to introduce some minor revisions of the manuscript as identified below.

In the objective section authors declared that they conducted a synthesis of quantitative evidence but this is a systematic review of qualitative studies. I think that the term “quantitative” might be a mix up word, and for this reason I suggest to remove the term as already done in the manuscript (line 109)

Answer: Our team would like to thank you for the invaluable comments and suggestions. All co-authors speak highly of your constructive comments which definitely improved the quality of this manuscript. Please see our response in italics. As suggested by the reviewer, we removed the term “quantitative”.

2. In this section authors declared they used meta-aggregation approach and followed ENTRQ statement. In my opinion the table reported in appendix 1 is very useful for the readers, however the ENTRQ in section 2 “Synthesis methodology” suggests to describe the rationale for choice of methodology, I therefore suggest to the authors to add a brief explanation to clarify why they adopted the meta-aggregation approach.

Answer: Thank you for the suggestion. We added the information about the reason why we choose meta-aggregation as the synthesis approach in this systematic review. Please see this information in line 166-171.

3. Pages 7-8 from line 179 to line 191: The sentences here are not very clear, the concepts reported here are clear but the way they are written is a little bit confusing, and I therefore suggest to review and simplify them.

Answer: The suggested correction has been made. Please see line 192-201.

4. Page 16, from line 436 to 438: the authors declared as follows: “This finding added to our knowledge that nursing students regarded instructors acted without professionalism as incivility to them, which was different form the faculty-to faculty incivility”. Please add a reference to support this statement.

Answer: As suggested by the reviewer, citation and reference were added in line 453-454 and line 636-637.

5. Page 17, from line 454 to 456 the authors reported as follows: “Universities and hospitals have an ethical mandate to ensure nursing students, and preceptors, are practicing in areas that don’t negatively influence student health and help students to form professionalism”. I agree with the authors even if I suggest them to add a reference to better support the sentence.

Answer: Please see the citation and reference in line 470-472 and line 650-652.

6. Page 17, line 459 and line 464 the authors started the sentences as follows: “previous studies.....” “some studies believed...”. Please add some references to support these statements.

Answer: Please see the new citation and reference were in line 475-476, line 480-481, and line 659-662.

7. Page 17, lines 478- 479 “the consequences of overload and unmanaged stress are the dance of civility”, considering the meaning of the sentence maybe the authors meant to say the dance of “incivility”, and not “civility”.

Answer: The word has been revised as suggested. Please see line 495.

8. Finally, as a last comment it is suggested to review the English because in the text there are several linguistic inaccuracies.

Answer: Thank you very much again. The manuscript has been copyedited.

Reviewer #2:

1. Thanks for the opportunity to review the paper. It is a comprehensive systematic review of nursing students' experiences with faculty incivility in clinical education context using the meta-synthesis method. A well-organized and clear abstract. A typo was found in the Objective "...synthesize the quantitative evidence" should be "...qualitative evidence".

Answer: We greatly appreciate the following invaluable suggestion. This term "quantitative" has been removed.

2. Line 136 Please include more search terms such as P.I.C.O..

Answer: This information was added in Line 143-145.

3. Line 144 A brief description of the JBI tool is needed here.

Answer: More information about JBI tool has been added as the reviewer suggested. Please see Line 152-155.

4. Line 145 What is the rate of disagreement?

Answer: The disagreement rate between two reviewers was 6.6%. This information has been added under quality assessment section. Please see line 219-220.

5. Line 163 What does it mean by stating "highest level" of credibility. How many levels are there?

Answer: The credibility for each research finding was rated with a level of credibility based on unequivocal (U), credible (C), or unsupported (UN). More information about credibility was added in line 178 and line 192-201.

6. The third paragraph "Quality assessment" is better to be placed before the paragraph "Study description" for the sake of logic and the order of tables since Table 2 was stated before Table 1 in the current manuscript.

Answer: Thank you again. As suggested by the reviewer, paragraph "Quality assessment" (line 213-220) was placed before paragraph "Study description"(line 222-235).

7. Inconsistent initials (uppercase and lowercase letters) were found in Table 3.

Answer: We are very sorry for these mistakes. Now correction has been made.

8. Line 340 The sentence "Three subthemes were categorized including negative coping, positive coping, and seeding the future." seems to be inconsistent with Table 3 and the statements in the manuscript. If I understand it correctly, there are only negative and positive copings in the synthesized findings. Please clarify that.

Answer: We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript. We agreed with the reviewer and changed this sentence as suggested. Please see changes highlighted in line 355.

9. A detailed and comprehensive discussion is provided. All in all, the topic is interesting and I would like to see it published after minor revisions.

Answer: We sincerely thank the reviewer for valuable comments, which were helpful in revising the manuscript.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Valentina Bressan Udine University
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Nov-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	Dear Authors, I went through your article again and read it. I have noticed that you did answer to all the reviewers indications, and the amendments done did improve your manuscript. I have no further indications to give you, and I think you did do a good job!