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Reviewer's report:

1. Title
   # The title can be revised as “Blended e-learning on the end of life care in England’s nursing home: A small-scale mixed-method case study. [Minor Essential Revisions]

2. Abstract
   # The aim of this study was listed on the last paragraph of background, but it did not include barriers to change in practice that was presented in results. Please consider word limitations for publication and make a decision to add or delete the content of barriers to change in practice (pp. 24-27). [Major Compulsory Revisions].

3. Background
   # The research question of this study was presented on the last four lines (p. 5), yet it did not encompass barriers to change in practice that was presented in results. Please consider word limitations for publication and make a decision to add or delete the content of barriers to change in practice (pp. 24-27). [Major Compulsory Revisions]

   # Please check the required format of citations (p. 3) and space between words (pp. 4, 14, & 16), i.e. 1-2, 3-4, 5, therequistite, attitudesthrough, strategiessuch...[Minor Essential Revisions]

   # Please check and change the sequence of citations and references, i.e. 6, 19...[Minor Essential Revisions]

4. Methods
   # The order of methods was needed to reorganize as research design, research setting, study participants, instruments, the educational intervention, data collection, data analysis, and research ethics. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

   # “mixed-methods” can be added between “a” and “case” on the first sentence in order to be consistent with the title and abstract (p. 6). [Minor Essential Revisions]

   # The content of research design on line 4 to 13 can be moved to instruments and reorganized again (p. 6). i.e., In this study, data collection....to analysis. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

   # Two paragraphs can be added the heading of “the educational intervention”
(pp. 7-8). It is better to list a table for concisely showing the training program regarding learning objectives, teaching strategies and activities, teaching content, training hours, and evaluation methods as well as cut the content of the training program. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

# The content of data collection can be added the heading of “instruments” and moved to post study participants (pp. 10-13). The operational definitions of quantitative tools were still not clear (i.e., Likert scale with 4-point rating scale, 1 = ?, 4 = ?, possible range of the total score, the higher score indicates…). [Major Compulsory Revisions]

# The last sentence of the data analysis can be deleted because the manuscript does not use paired t test or Wilcoxon signed rank test (p. 13). [Major Compulsory Revisions]

5. Results

# There was no aim or research question for the content of barriers to change in practice (pp. 15 & 24-27). [Major Compulsory Revisions]

# Please clarify the meanings of the first and second paragraphs (p. 16). The largest increases in mean levels of confidence should be advance care planning/end of life care tools (mean difference = 1.0 or mean shift = 45.6%). The sentence of “the latter competency area… items,” “and post-course confidence levels of 3.64…level of 3.58,” and “the post-course confidence scores of the six items…further improvement” were unclear to the reader. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

# The title of the table 2 linking with the additional file should be revised as table 3. [Minor Essential Revisions]

6. Discussion and conclusions

NA

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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