

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.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Can nurse teachers manage student incivility by guided democracy? A Grounded Theory Study
AUTHORS	Rad, Mostafa; Karimi Moonaghi, Hossein; Ildarabadi, Eshagh

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Carol E Fletcher Veterans Health Administration United States of America
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Dec-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Your paper addresses a potentially important issue in nursing education. Incivility in the classroom may well continue into a nurse's professional practice. Determining why incivility occurs and then making suggestions for how to correct it add to the literature related to the education of nurses.</p> <p>However, before your paper is ready for publication it must be edited grammatically by someone who is fluent in the use of the English language. I could not do nearly as well as you if I were trying to publish in another language. Nevertheless, words that are used inappropriately must be corrected before the article is published. For instance on page 2 "those with focusing on the lived experiences" should say "those focusing on the lived experiences" or "incivility is becoming a progressively challenge" should say "progressive challenge".</p> <p>There are some misspellings, for instance "usally". There are also words that simply do not convey the meaning intended, for instance it would make more sense to refer to incivility "incidents" rather than "accidents".</p> <p>The aim could actually be stated in 2 parts, (1) to discover experiences of incivility, and (2) to develop an approach for managing incivility.</p> <p>It is interesting that you list lack of the inclusion of students' family members in the study as a limitation. Although it is true that family experiences may affect whether a student is uncivil, it would be a rather unusual study that included the family members of those being interviewed. It is also not clear why the fact that the participants were experienced and knowledgeable is listed as a limitation.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Dr Lynn Sayer King's College London UK
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Dec-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Re Point 8 above, although references are up to date and appropriate regarding the topic of incivility there is limited literature regarding the research method.</p> <p>This is an important topic and has the makings of a good paper however there were some significant limitations which I believe need addressing before this paper is ready for publication. The standard of English very poor especially in the introduction and obscures the meaning in a number of places. This needs to be addressed prior to publication.</p> <p>There are a number of sections where the meaning is unclear: page 3 lines 10-13; 18-20; 21;31-35; 36-37; 41 page 4 lines 18-21; 58 page 5 lines 3; 8; 23-26; 35 page 8 lines 14; 19-21; 22-26 page 9 lines 4-7; 18-23; 28; 31; 33; 43-46; 55-58 page 10 lines 41-43 page 13 lines 24-26</p> <p>Lots of statements/phrases are used without explanation making their meaning unclear, this applies to some of the above pages but also includes statements such as: p3 line 30 what are 'civilized behaviours'?; p5 line 8 the 'right path'?; 'ideal learner'? p 8 line 16 and many of the other statements in the results (see comment below).</p> <p>Regarding the method - codes, categories and core category are appropriately stated using grounded theory then a statement lived experience (p4 line 8) and themes (throughout the paper) are included which are not appropriate. Theme and category seem to be used interchangeably which adds confusion and method blurring.</p> <p>Results page 5, guided democracy is identified as the core category but after this it is one of four themes. Page 6 line 39 mentions 4 themes, three are then listed lines 45-47. On page 7 guided democracy is the third of four themes listed in a table). page 9 guided democracy then becomes a causal condition (line 4). This paragraph does not make sense, how can guided democracy create the first theme? Overall these pages make the work very confusion.</p> <p>The presentation of the results was insufficient to provide the reader with a clear understanding of how the themes and sub themes had been identified and what they meant. Under each theme and sub theme lists were provided with a quote at the end from a participant. In themselves the lists meant very little without any explanatory context for example what do any of the following mean? unfamiliarity with the ethical position p8 line 24; low preparation rates p9 line 5; scattered incivility p 9 line 8; abnormality of individuals p 9 line 28; unbearable behaviours p 9 line 32 (these are a small number of many).</p> <p>Participant quotes at the end of sections stand alone and were offered with no interpretation regarding what they meant or how they</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>explicitly exemplified the sub theme. The core category appeared to be presented as the same level of all themes (see above regarding the blurring of methods here).</p> <p>Discussion - there are many statements where the authors report that their concepts/themes correspond with others but as the themes had not been sufficiently developed in the results section and what the themes in the other studies meant, as only titles were given, it is impossible for the reader to assess the accuracy of such statements.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Response to Reviewer: 1

The manuscript edited grammatically by two translators who are fluent in the use of the English language. Other misspellings and mistake corrected.

Statements of aim were corrected based on reviewer comments.

Limitation about family member of students corrected.

Response to Reviewer: 2

The total of manuscript edited standard English by two translators who are fluent in the use of the English language. We paid especial attention to all the mentioned pages and lines such as:

page 3 lines 10-13; 18-20; 21;31-35; 36-37; 41

page 4 lines 18-21; 58

page 5 lines 3; 8; 23-26; 35

page 8 lines 14; 19-21; 22-26

page 9 lines 4-7; 18-23; 28; 31; 33; 43-46; 55-58

page 10 lines 41-43

page 13 lines 24-26

All the unclear statements/phrases corrected, for example:

p3 line 30 what are 'clivilized behaviours'?; p5 line 8 the 'right path'?; 'ideal learner'? p 8 line 16 and many of the other statements in the results (see comment below).

We considered the reviewer 2 comments and changed the title of categories and provided more details about them. We substitute "themes and subthemes" with "categories and subcategories". We tried to reorganize our results to be clearer as it can be seen in the manuscript (changes were identified by track changes).

We rewrite many parts of results to make them clearer. For example we considered marked pages and lines (unfamiliarity with the ethical position p8 line 24; low preparation rates p9 line 5; scattered incivility p 9 line 8; abnormality of individuals p 9 line 28; unbearable behaviours p 9 line 32 (these are a small number of many)) and corrected them.

In the part of discussion, we tried to use suitable statements and present meaningful discussion. We provided sufficient details about our results and this make the discussion more understandable.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Carol E Fletcher Veterans Administration Ann Arbor Medical Center United States
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Feb-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors have obviously worked hard on their revisions and have greatly improved the manuscript since their previous submission. They are to be commended.</p> <p>However, because they still struggle somewhat with English as a second language, I have attached a copy of the complete manuscript with my suggested edits so that the standard of written English will be acceptable for publication.</p> <p>I have also included a number of comments that call for minor clarifications in the manuscript in addition to the grammatical edits. Once these are addressed I would consider the manuscript ready for submission.</p> <p>The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We edited text based on reviewer (DR. Carol E Fletcher) recommendations about minor clarification and grammatical edits. I made all recommended correction. Correction were marked in the text by using track changes mode in MS Word. My thanks also go to respected editor and Dr. Carol E Fletcher, for her help in improving the language and methodology of this article. We gladly accept other proposed amendments.