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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. The aim of the study is not clearly defined or delimited.
   - The definition of competence that the authors used in the manuscript is very ambiguous “A judgement which influenced whether an individual was willing or not to undertake an activity”.
   - Several literature sources consider competence includes knowledge, skills and attitudes relating to professionalism in a complex scenario. This concept is a fundamental part of the theoretical framework and in the instrument must be clear.
   - I agree that the instrument measures confidence and knowledge in specific situations, but not competence in managing chronic kidney disease.
   - Therefore, title and objective of the instrument and discussion should be modified. According to what is actually measured the instrument.

2. There is inconsistency between title and aim of the article and the instrument.
   - The objective written in the instrument (compare two interventions ...) should be according with the proposed objective in developing and validating the instrument (to measure the confidence and competence).
   - The articles usually don’t show a link to access the instrument. The instrument should be a fundamental part in the redaction of the article.
   - The instrument displays some observations in process, that suggest is not it the final versión yet?

3. The redaction shows inconsistencies in the use of abbreviations and order of the references.
   - For example: in the introduction after the reference number 7 is the number 34.
   - The references 4,14,26 and 30 have problems in the redaction.
   - Others errors: Error! Bookmark not defined  ¿????.

4. Results.
   - Tables 1 and 2 are not observed completely.
   - Figures 1 and 2 were duplicated.
The authors annexed an Excel file, is it as part of the article?

Final comments. I believe that the instrument could be useful in the terms mentioned and the authors should be made an extra effort in the suggested improvements. My point of view is that the article should not be published in the current conditions.

Reference.


Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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