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Reviewer's report:

Please number your comments and divide them into

- Major Compulsory Revisions

There needs to be a sample table at the individual level, not just of the facility and NP characteristics, as in Table 1. It is unclear how many participants were included in each of the four focus groups and how many in each were family vs. residents.

Other key information not included in methods is who conducted the focus groups? Was member checking done which is usually a key piece to methodological rigor?

Some of the strategies to promote rigor that are mentioned in the methods section seem to just be cut and pasted with not enough detail. Specifically what is the example of negative case analysis or investigator triangulation?

In Results there is overwhelmingly more family quotes and examples than resident quotes. I recommend inclusion of more from the actual resident’s perspective.

The themes and subthemes are interesting and contribute to the literature.

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.