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Reviewer's report:

It is important for geriatric/gerontological clinicians to have access to well-developed and tested interventions upon which to plan care delivery for older people experiencing depression in the home care sector. This study provides initial evidence for the feasibility, acceptability, and sustained effects of a nurse-led mental health promotion intervention. The manuscript is crisp and well-organized and includes explicit text that describes research intent, rationale, methodological approaches, clearly explained variables and measures, and statistical analyses.

The manuscript reports findings in a fashion that aligns with the methodology (QUANT + qual) and are of both statistical significance and clinical importance. The findings support that the nurse-led mental health promotion intervention is feasible, acceptable and sustainable over time. Discussion and implications are grounded in the data provided. To enhance the manuscript the following Discretionary Revisions should be considered:

1. The manuscript title includes the term "Interprofessional". Having read and re-read the manuscript several times, the findings appear to support the Nurse-led component, and there is little evidence that emphasizes the impact of the IPP component of the intervention. Please consider revision of the findings section or the title to address this problem, or address the IPP component in more detail in the findings and discussion section.

2. On pages 4 and 7 of the manuscript you introduce the notion of personal support services (PSS) but this is not explicitly defined in glossary of terms or the text. Please explicate for readers who will not be familiar with the specific services that PSS entails in the depression context. Does this infer inclusion of personal support workers (PSWs) as part of the service provided?

3. The Nurse-led mental health promotion intervention itself is described briefly in the manuscript and a reference is included that provides more detailed description. Despite the description of the intervention in the manuscript, some questions emerge. On page 10 it is stated that the intervention is offered "in addition to usual home care services". Please provide a short sentence explicating standard care. The manuscript could be improved by including a short table that explicates the intervention details; it is difficult to follow in the body of the text. On page 12 of the manuscript you briefly describe the four-pronged approach to implementation. You state that the three-day workshops were held
separately. It is not clear if you mean that the workshops were delivered to the RNs and PSWs in two distinct professional groups, rather than workshop attendance mixed to reflect the RN-PSW dyads within which they would be implementing the interventions. Please make this clear. At this point of the manuscript, it might be helpful to move your explication of the number of RN-PSW teams from page 20. Also, include more detail with respect to the distinct psychosocial support role played by the PSWs, and how this role differs from that of the RNs. Perhaps a table referenced on page 11 would help make this clear. It is not clear whether the case conferences described on page 11 involved the whole 13 member team of RNs and PSWs working together in tandem, or just the unique dyad assigned to the individual case. Please clarify.

4. The manuscript is dense with information. Some points are raised early on in the manuscript that do not appear again. For example, on page 7 you mention a gap in the literature with respect to inclusion of older adults with dementia in the evaluation of other nurse-led interventions related to the depression context, and introduce inclusion of persons with dementia on page 10, but you do not report specific findings with respect to those persons with dementia in your study other than to say that they consist of 31% of the population. Please consider addressing this to a greater extent in the findings, discussion, and implications sections. What is the significance of this finding?

5. Overall, the qualitative findings are clear and reflect the nature of a multiple methods study (QUANT + qual design). On page 20 of the manuscript it is stated that caring, emotional support, reassurance, and encouragement was perceived as a "key factor" in treating depression from the perspective of the older adult participants. This seems to be supported by the qualitative feedback from home care providers as reported on page 21. However, this is not mentioned explicitly in the discussion section, nor is the notion of a relational measure of some kind introduced for consideration in future studies. On page 21 of the manuscript you mention that family caregivers valued the recognition and support they received as a result of the intervention. This is not mentioned again in the discussion section, nor a family satisfaction measure of some kind suggested for consideration in future studies. On page 25 of the manuscript it is stated that there was a significant increase in the study RNs self-reported knowledge and confidence in caring for community-living older adults with depressive symptoms. PSWs are not mentioned in this sentence. Was this an oversight, or were these data not captured for PSWs, but only RNs? Please clarify. In addition, it is not completely clear as to whether the self-report of these data was quantitative or qualitative in nature. Was this an SE measure of some kind, or were these open-ended questions during a focus group or interview? Please clarify.

6. On page 28 of the manuscript you provide delivery rates for the components of the intervention, reporting 28% on development of the IP depression management plan as compared to 78% for depression education. Could this smaller time commitment to development of the plan relate to the number of RNs compared to the number of PSWs on the team? Do these findings have any implications for future research looking at the composition and distinct roles of the nurse-led teams (RN:RPN:PSW ratio for example)?
7. On page 30 of the manuscript it is stated, "Overall, these findings underscore the important role of home care in the prevention, early identification, and management of depression in this vulnerable population". It may be an overstatement to include "prevention" in this sentence. Are there findings in this study that support the notion that this intervention "prevents" depression? Consider replacing this word with "screening".

8. On page 33 of the manuscript you state that older adults with multiple chronic conditions are best served by an IP team of professional and non-professional PSWs with complementary skills to address the biopsychosocial determinants of depression. To support this statement, it would be helpful to include a short table earlier in the manuscript (see comments under points 3 and 6 above) that explicates the specific complementary skills that the PSWs provided to the intervention that are unique to the contributions provided by the RNs involved in the intervention.
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