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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The research question is well defined.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.
3. Are the data sound? Data appear to be sound--more information on how trustworthiness was ensured would be helpful.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes--clearer implications for clinical practice would contribute to the strength of the manuscript.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? There is a large body of knowledge on caring in nursing and it would not be possible to summarize it in depth, but the authors have identified important literature.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes--just one "can't" that should be "cannot" and "psychological" should be changed to "psycho-social"

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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