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Nursing instruction improves outcomes for lupus and rheumatoid arthritis patients receiving steroid pulse therapy

The theme is very interesting. There are some viewpoints which are important to clarify.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The aim of the study was to provide a basis for the formulation of nursing guidelines for pulse therapy patients. What are the research questions? The authors could clarify them.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The study is descriptive, comparative research. What kind is exactly the study design? The figure about the design would be very illustrative.

3. Are the data sound?

The data were appropriate.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The manuscript is written according scientific guidelines.
I was missing some viewpoints about theoretical background.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion part is needed more critical discussion about limitations. Also discussion about ethical aspects is missing.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

see 5

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
both published and unpublished?
There are some references concerning this study.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title and abstract are appropriate.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is acceptable with minor revisions.

Reviewer's report
-----------------

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. What is the theoretical background and what kind of are theoretical assumptions?
2. Formulation of research questions.
3. What kind of is study design? (Figure)
4. Especially discussion part is important to clarify: limitations and ethical aspects

- Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)

- Level of interest

---------------

- An article of importance in its field
- Quality of written English

---------------

- Acceptable

Statistical review
-----------------

- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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