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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses important and timely topic for aging world, how to promote a meaningful daily life in long-term care facility. The results are useful to understand lived-experience of the participants, especially for people in another culture. However, I have some points to be addressed before publication. I am afraid that some of my comments might be inappropriate for PAAR research because I am unfamiliar with the methodology; In that case the authors can explain in response comments without revision of the manuscript.

• Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Add more detailed explanation on the concept “meaningful daily life” using more references in background section, so that readers could understand significance of this theme. I guess one of reasons of insufficient academic explanation about this concept might be that Swedish national guideline use this concept.

2. In the methods section, there seems to be inconsistency of description. I show some points to be considered below. You may want to revise this section by means of these points or to add some rationale for the description.

   - Though the authors emphasize the differences between PAAR and other action research, many references in methods section are related to the action research and qualitative research such as [22]. It seems to be strange for me, a researcher unfamiliar with PAAR.

   - The authors did not refer [25] in the data collection section, though the article was used in the next data analysis section. It also seems to be strange because in most qualitative approach, data collection and analysis are conducted simultaneously.

   - Add some explanation why the authors adopted a life world hermeneutic approach as an analysis method in their PAAR research.

3. I could not understand significance/effectiveness of using Tuan’s concepts in this manuscript. Why and how the authors find the relationship between their tentative interpretations and the Tuan’s concepts. Add more explanation in the manuscript or response comments.

4. Also, I could not fully understand what this manuscript added in the knowledge in this area, though I enjoyed the results as a nursing researcher in another culture. How are the results different from other previous articles referring to
residents’ experience and perspective? How the results deepen our understanding of the participants? Clarify the authors’ standpoint.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**

  1. In second paragraph of background section, the authors may want to explain why they focused on obstacles, opportunities, and solutions to developing the meaningful daily life. These words seem to appear suddenly at last sentence in background section.

  2. From my point of view, tentative themes/interpretations do not have to be included in the final manuscript, because the main interpretation could explain the tentative interpretations. Please add more detailed explanation why the authors/the methodology include both tentative and main interpretation in the manuscript for readers unfamiliar with PAAR.

  3. Is it usual in the life world hermeneutic approach to use other scholars’ concept to develop “main interpretations” as the authors used Tuan’s concepts? Add some explanation in the data analysis section

- **Discretionary Revisions**

  1. The authors may want to add some explanation about the ethical review board. What types of organization had the board? Why the authors did not submit their proposal to an academic institution?

  2. The authors used both words: “tentative themes” and “tentative interpretation”. This might confuse readers who are unfamiliar with PAAR.

  3. Referring Tuan’s work in earlier section such as background or first paragraph of the results section might help readers understanding though this might be inappropriate for PAAR research.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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