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Associate editor comments:

- The addition to the title - (audio lecture recordings): - does not need to be included in the title as it is adequately explained.

This has been removed from the title.

- I am not sure the term 'Community matron' is well understood by those outside the UK. Might be better to use something more descriptive such as community-based nurses.

The term ‘community matron’ has been changed to ‘community-based nurses’ as suggested.

Page 10, paragraph 1, line1.

Reviewer: Edward Palmer

- This is a well written article. I disagree with adding audio to the title as it makes it quite cumbersome, but it is not a serious concern.

This has been removed from the title.

- I read the authors comments and citations on purposive sampling and accept their approach, which was my only major concern with the paper. I do believe that it would be worthwhile including some of the comments written in the cover letter in the methods section of the manuscript. I would recommend the authors make this change.

The methodology section ‘Participants’ has been amended to include specific reference to the purposive nature of the sampling and how this was achieved.

Page 9, paragraph 3, lines 2-4.

The methodology section ‘Participants’ has also been amended to include the number of participants expressed as a percentage of the cohort.

Page 9, paragraph 4, line 1.

- The authors write "or through the use of video podcasts". They may wish to define those as vodcasts "or through the use of video; in this case they are known as vodcasts".

The introduction has been amended to include the definition of vodcasts.
Page 4, paragraph 2, lines 7-8

- There is some ambiguity about which study they refer to in the paper and they do refer to a previous study of theirs quite often which can cause confusion. I would suggest they use "previous study" and the "current study" consistently to avoid ambiguity.

The introduction and discussion sections of the manuscript have been amended to utilise 'previous study' and 'current study' as suggested, in order to avoid confusion for the reader.

Page 6, paragraph 1, line 1
Page 6, paragraph 1, line 9
Page 6, paragraph 1, line 14
Page 7, paragraph 2, line 1
Page 8, paragraph 2, line 1
Page 21, paragraph 1, line 1
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