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Reviewer's report:

A need for a multifaceted approach to guideline implementation: perceptions of oncology nurses

Thank you for letting me review this paper.

The paper focuses on guideline implementation. The topic is very important and it covers a global concern in nursing: a lack of effective guideline implementation and their use in clinical practice. We definitely need more research in this area. In generally, the paper is well written and interesting. Its outcomes support existing literature.

We may also ask what is the added value of this paper and what new information this paper will offer to the readers. Although Biomed Central may want to offer papers for international audience, the rationale behind the paper could be focused more on the situation in Japan. For example, the knowledge gap mentioned in this paper; it would be important to be aware how familiar nurses in Japan are with existing guidelines (based on the previous literature), how well are guidelines implemented in clinical practice in Japan etc. More detailed information about the situation in Japan could explain why this study needs to be done in Japan and with qualitative methods.

1. The question posed

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the oncology nurses for adoption and implementing practice guidelines. The overall goal is clear although at quite general level. Therefore, more focused research questions could be offered. For example, the authors have described hindering factors or barriers for the guideline implementation.

2. Methods

See point 4.

3. Soundness of the data

The data have been collected with focus group interviews (11 nurses and 2 groups). The topic of the questions used in interviews have been very structured (e.g. adaptation and implementation; areas to be developed; strategies). Some questions will require yes/no answer. More detailed description are needed for the rationale for the data collection method and data used to answer the research
questions (with references).

4. Standards of reporting

In generally, the methods used are quite well described. I would still recommend that the authors could use some checklists to ensure that all details of the methods used have been described. This would increase the quality of the paper.

See an example: Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups

ALLISON TONG, PETER SAINSBURY, AND JONATHAN CRAIG

5-6. Discussion and conclusions & limitations of the study

The discussion and conclusions are quite “strong” keeping in mind that the data have been collected with qualitative methods; 11 nurses have participated out of 30; and the goal of the paper has been described at very general level.

As a limitation of the study, it should be discussed more, how questions used in the interview may have affected nurses’ answers or their general attitudes to the guidelines. (e.g. the questions have focused strongly on challenges, difficulties, non-using, difficulties to understand etc.)

7. Acknowledgements have been identified.

8. Title and abstract

The paper have used concepts, such as multifaceted approach, multidisciplinary care, and multilevel challenges and solutions. Where the title “...multifaceted approach” has came?

Further, in Abstract the goal of the paper differ from Page 5 (ADOPTION and implementation).

9. The paper is generally clear and well written.

I hope that these comments help the authors to modify the paper.
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