

Authors' Response to Editor and Reviewers' Comments

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We sincerely appreciate your time and effort in reviewing our manuscript. We are grateful for your insightful comments and constructive feedback, which have significantly improved the clarity, rigor, and impact of our study. We have considered each point raised and have made the necessary revisions accordingly. Below, we provide detailed responses to each comment, indicating how the manuscript has been revised to address the concerns. [All modifications done are colored blue.](#)

We believe the revisions have significantly improved the clarity, rigor, and contribution of our work. We respectfully request reconsideration of our manuscript for publication and remain open to any further revisions that may be required.

Thank you again for your guidance and the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript.

Editor's Comments

1. Please ensure that your manuscript meets PLOS ONE's style requirements, including those for file naming. The PLOS ONE style templates can be found at:

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/file?id=wjVg/PLOSONe_formatting_sample_main_body.pdf

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/file?id=ba62/PLOSONe_formatting_sample_title_authors_affiliations.pdf

Authors' Response:

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have revised the manuscript to align with PLOS ONE's formatting requirements and file naming conventions.

2. Please provide captions for Figure 3 in your manuscript.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for the clarification. We added the captions for all figures stated in the manuscript.

3. Please include a complete copy of PLOS' questionnaire on inclusivity in global research in your revised manuscript.

Authors' Response:

We appreciate this request. We uploaded the PLOS' questionnaire on inclusivity in global research as Supporting Information, as per PLOS ONE's guidelines.

4. Your ethics statement should only appear in the Methods section of your manuscript. If your ethics statement is written in any section besides the Methods, please delete it from any other section.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for your feedback. We have ensured that the ethics statement appears only in the Methods section and have removed any redundant mentions elsewhere in the manuscript.

5. Please remove your figures from within your manuscript file, leaving only the individual TIFF/EPS image files, uploaded separately. These will be automatically included in the reviewers' PDF.

Authors' Response:

We appreciate this clarification. We have removed the figures from the manuscript file and have uploaded them separately.

Reviewer #1 Comments

1. The qualitative analysis mentions Braun and Clarke's framework but does not specify how intercoder reliability was ensured. Were multiple researchers involved in coding? If so, how were disagreements resolved? Providing more details would enhance the trustworthiness of the findings.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for this suggestion. We have now provided a more detailed explanation of our approach to intercoder reliability in the Methods section. Specifically, two independent researchers manually coded the data. They initially worked separately to identify themes, then compared their findings and discussed discrepancies until reaching consensus. This process ensured consistency and minimized bias, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness of our qualitative analysis.

2. While the study acknowledges certain limitations, it should discuss how these might impact the findings and interpretations. For instance, the sample includes students and educators from a single institution. How might this affect the generalizability of the results? Consider discussing whether similar findings could be expected in other cultural or educational settings.

Authors' Response:

We appreciate this recommendation. We have expanded the Limitations section to discuss how the single-institution sample may impact generalizability. While the findings provide valuable insights, they may not be fully generalizable to other nursing programs with different curricula, institutional cultures, or technological infrastructures. Future research involving diverse educational settings and international comparisons is recommended to validate and extend our findings.

3. The ethical concerns regarding ChatGPT's use (plagiarism, over-reliance, and privacy issues) are well-identified. However, the study would benefit from a deeper discussion on potential solutions. Could existing ethical frameworks in nursing education provide guidance?

Authors' Response:

Thank you for highlighting this point. We have expanded our discussion to incorporate ethical frameworks from nursing education, such as the American Nurses Association (ANA) Code of Ethics and the International Council of Nurses (ICN) Code of Ethics. These frameworks emphasize responsible AI use, professional accountability, and ethical decision-making. Additionally, we have suggested institutional policies, academic integrity guidelines, and structured AI literacy training programs to mitigate ethical risks and ensure responsible ChatGPT use in nursing education.

Reviewer #2 Comments

1. The introduction discusses AI/ChatGPT adoption, but no adoption theory has been utilized to assess attitudes toward ChatGPT. The absence of a theoretical framework weakens the study's foundation.

Authors' Response:

We appreciate this important observation. In response, we have now explicitly incorporated the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the theoretical framework guiding our study. TAM provides a structured approach to understanding users' perceptions, attitudes, and adoption of ChatGPT in academic settings. We have revised the Introduction section to reflect this addition.

2. The research gap is not clearly established, making it unclear why this study was conducted. Without a well-defined gap, the study's objectives seem questionable.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for this valuable feedback. We have revised the Introduction section to clearly articulate the research gap. Our study uniquely addresses this gap by exploring ChatGPT's role within the discipline-specific context of nursing education with both students and educators ample and mixed-methods approach to complement and integrate findings.

3. Numerous studies already exist on the adoption of ChatGPT, particularly regarding knowledge and attitudes. The authors have not adequately demonstrated how this study differs from previous research. Specifically, it is unclear whether findings from nursing students would differ significantly from those of students in other domains.

Authors' Response:

We appreciate this concern. We have now included a comparative discussion in the Introduction and Discussion sections, highlighting how our study differs from prior research. While general AI adoption studies exist, our research focuses on nursing education, a field with unique ethical, practical, and critical thinking demands. The findings provide domain-specific insights that distinguish nursing students' perspectives from those in other academic disciplines.

4. Although the study focuses on nursing students, no domain-specific questions were included. This omission limits the study's relevance to nursing education.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for this observation. All participants were nursing students and educators, ensuring that responses were inherently discipline-specific. We explicitly use the word "nursing" in our qualitative questions. We have clarified this in the Methods section.

5. The sample size raises concerns. The manuscript first states that 240 students participated but then mentions that the minimum recommended sample size was 169. If the entire population was invited to participate, why was a sample-based inference needed?

Authors' Response:

We appreciate the reviewer's observation regarding sample size clarification. While the minimum recommended sample size was calculated to be 169 based on power analysis, we invited the entire student population (N = 300) to participate in order to enhance representativeness and reduce selection bias. A total of 240 students responded, exceeding the minimum requirement and thereby strengthening the reliability and generalizability of the findings.

Sample-based inference was still appropriate because not all members of the population responded. Thus, statistical inference was necessary to estimate the characteristics of the broader student population and examine associations among variables. This approach aligns with best practices in survey-based educational research.

6. The analysis appears overly simplistic, relying on basic statistical techniques such as ANOVA and elementary graphs. A more robust analytical approach would have strengthened the findings.

Authors' Response:

Thank you for this valuable feedback. In response, we have expanded the statistical analysis to include Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses in addition to the originally reported ANOVA. These advanced methods allow us to explore predictive relationships and associations between variables more robustly. We have also added five quantitative tables, four figures, and one qualitative table with a graphical summary to enhance data visualization and interpretation. These enhancements provide a deeper and more rigorous analysis of ChatGPT adoption in nursing education and strengthen the overall credibility and impact of our findings.

Authors' Response to Reviewer 2's Final Comment:

We appreciate the reviewer's critical feedback and acknowledge the concerns raised. We have taken substantial steps to improve the manuscript by addressing all comments. While we recognize that the reviewer initially did not recommend the manuscript for publication, we genuinely value constructive criticism, as it allows us to refine and enhance our work. The revisions we have made—including strengthening the statistical analyses, incorporating a theoretical framework, clarifying the research gap, and refining discussions on ethical considerations—aim to elevate the study's rigor and relevance. Beside the nature of mixed-methods study and its value.

We sincerely hope that these improvements align with the journal's quality expectations. We kindly request reconsideration of our revised manuscript and welcome any further suggestions to enhance its contribution to the field.

We hope that our revisions have sufficiently addressed all concerns. Thank you again for your constructive feedback and guidance. We look forward to your further evaluation.

Sincerely,

Corresponding Author: Prof. Ebtsam