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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revision required

Thank you for asking me to review the above manuscript. It is interesting to see that the care system in the Netherlands experiences the same problems as the United Kingdom such as understaffing and lack of education of care staff and managers. I have prepared my report using the questions listed in the guidelines for reviewers.

1. The research questions posed were well defined but not well answered within the manuscript.

2. The methods used may be appropriate but are not well described in the text. Initially a short description of the previous work done would have been useful to aid readers who have not had access to the first manuscript. One possible improvement would be the inclusion of a study diagram which would clarify numbers of homes, participants, respondents, and measures of outcomes. There is little or no description of the content of the inter RAI-LTCF instrument, methods used and copies of the inter RAI-LTCF, questionnaires and semi-structured interview questions are not appended. It is not clear if staff were trained together, individually, or in grade-related groups. Under Measurements and data analyses (p6) it would be helpful to repeat the two research questions to save the reader having to refer back.

3. It is difficult to comment as to whether the data are sound because, as mentioned in the previous question the actual data collection tools are not provided and in-depth statistical information is lacking. There is a serious deficiency in that the authors have not attempted to collect any data on patient or quality of care outcomes.

4. The reporting of the results is difficult to follow due to the way in which it has been presented. Results should be grouped under each of the research questions, again repeated in full. Clear reference to results shown in tables is needed, and inclusion of numbers as well as percentages in the text [i.e 87.9% (16)]. The authors also show a tendency to discuss their results in this section, rather than in a separate discussion section. For example, this happens in the final sentences of the results section (p10)

5. There is no discussion section as the manuscript jumps from results to conclusions. The limitations of the work are clearly stated.
6. The authors acknowledge that they are building upon work which has previously been carried out but do not provide sufficient detail as to the methods used and the outcomes therefore more information is required.

7. Yes, however some explanation of this previous work would have been helpful for the reader.

8. Yes.

9. The standard of written English requires some revision before it reaches the appropriate level acceptable for publication.

I would suggest that some major compulsory revision of this manuscript is required before it is resubmitted.

The standard of the written English requires upgrading prior to publication.

It is not essential that the manuscript be seen by an expert statistician but some suggestions re the data have been included.
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