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Reviewer's report:

Social meanings and understandings in patient-nurse interaction in the community practice setting: a grounded theory study

The aim of the paper is to look at the social meanings and understandings at play within situated patient-nurse interactions in the community practice setting in a transforming health care service. While the topic is important there is a need for more clarity throughout the manuscript and a need to highlight the unique contribution this manuscript makes to the patient-nurse interaction literature.

The following considerations should be taken into account to enhance the manuscript:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The research on nurse-patient interactions is comprehensive and yet the literature review in this manuscript is sparse. In this manuscript perhaps more information is required on past studies in this area of inquiry.

2. Four sites were used in the study. What is not clear is was the data analyzed separately for each site and then combined or analyzed together? Are the four health care community services different and might this influence the findings?

3. Three different types of data collection procedures were used: observations, informal interviews and semi-structured interviews. What are the possible biases of these methods and what did the authors do to circumvent them?

4. The discussion section does not confirm or broaden any literature in this area so it is difficult to determine how this study fits within the area of inquiry.

5. In the conclusion section the authors suggest that seeking understanding from a social constructivist perspective could make a contribution to enhancing knowledge. Where does this conclusion come from as it is not mentioned in the discussion section?

6. Table 1 is not clear. What does population structure mean and what health indicators are being compared?

Minor Essential Revisions

7. The background begins with a discussion of the physician – patient interaction and yet the study is on the nurse-patient interaction. More clarity is required to
justify this choice.

8. The last section of the manuscript is the limitation section which should be embedded in the discussion section as it leaves the manuscript on a negative note.

9. Definitions of terms in the manuscript are warranted. For example, what is a “traditional grounded theory style” and what “requisite expertise has been transformed” because of the change in teams?

10. Also there are places in the manuscript where the sentences require editing and clarification: for example “In addition, a process of conscious reflection about position in the research as nurse researcher and interactive in the process was deployed throughout” and “size did not constrain the research design or depth of analysis” – size of what?

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interest