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Reviewer's report:

I have a number of major concerns in relation to this manuscript. Potentially the research maybe of value however they way it is presented needs major revision if readers are to make sense of the research.

The expression and also the ‘absolute’ statements need to be revised. Some examples of areas that need to be addresses are as follows:

When new nurses merely perform their nursing duties in hospitals, they have little or no experience in the clinical activities; however, they are required to assume full responsibilities…– I am uncertain about what is being said here

Owing to limited clinical skills and heavy work pressure, new nurses have low job satisfaction and poor commitment to their hospitals. – this needs to be substantiated and contextualized

A review of the references cited in this paper indicates – unnecessary words focus on the fact - unnecessary words

After garnering support from the participating hospitals – more detail is needed about what support was required and how it was ‘garnered’

Terms need to be explained eg – mentors earned the N2 level of the nursing ladder – these are not universal terms as far as I am aware

These statements are poorly written and I am quite unsure of their meaning - new staff nurses to be handled by nursing mentors in at least two months. However, the results of this study indicated that while new staff nurses worked in the hospitals, they would accept the clinical guidance provided by the mentors in almost four months and would also frequently interact with their mentors.

The following statements are made but there is no indication of the basis for these statements – where did this information come from? How was it deduced?

During the mentoring process, mentors would always assign challenging and learning tasks to mentees in order to improve the mentees’ knowledge and skills, provide career guidance, support the advancement of job position and business, help in resolving task-related problems, and further promote their overall growth.
Thus, the mentees could improve their knowledge and skills and have a clear picture about their career development and position advancement. Mentees felt stabilized, confident, and low-stressed in the workplace.

There are quite a number of broad statements made about mentors and mentees and these are presented as factual – I would urge the authors to discuss that relationships exist rather than infer a direct causal link.

The statistics and their presentation also need major modification

My strengths are not in statistics therefore I recommend that an expert comment however some basic points that need to be addressed are:

More information is needed about the sample
– what proportion of new nurses were sampled
– how were they selected
– what was the definition of new (employment in the last three months???)

I am unable to comment on all the tests - I am not familiar with the Harman’s one-factor test.

The questionnaire should be provided in the paper – The factor analysis should be explained and presented in a manor that is readily understood by the reader – it is complex at present. I use factor analysis however I could not understand the table that the authors presented.

Mean values are presented in the discussion of the tool – this is not appropriate.