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Reviewer's report:

This was an interesting study that examined what the SHD managers understand as the goals of telenursing and how managers view health promotion and equitable healthcare is implemented at SHD. Overall impressions is that this is an interesting study that will appeal to a broad range of readers but the study has a number of critical issues that need to be addressed before publication. I am not addressing some obvious formatting issues but have rather focused on the content. These issues are outlined below.

Major Revisions

1. Abstract
   - in the Methods, the qualitative design must be clarified. Exploratory and descriptive is not a qualitative design.
   - confused by the first sentence in the Conclusions statement. Why would be managers' perception of telenursing goals be different than the organizational goals?

2. Introduction
   - page 3, paragraph 1: Need a reference to support last statement of first paragraph.
   - page 4, paragraph 2: Unclear what is meant by 'telenurses themselves describe... and also mention supporting, strengthening and teaching callers, as well as facilitating their learning.' Need to clarify this.
   - page 5, paragraph 2: Need to specify the specific research questions.

3. Methods
   - page 5: In the Design section, specify the qualitative design used. Perhaps ethnography or phenomenology would be appropriate. What is stated is far too vague and not a true design. This must be addressed.
   - page 7: In Interviewing Process, which should more appropriately be situated with the Procedure section, need to clarify who participated in the pilot testing. Also, the authors state that pediatric calls were used as an example, but an example for what exactly? Finally, the authors need to specify what questions were asked in the study.

4. Results
- page 8: The authors provide a list of four themes but it is unclear what is the relative importance of each theme. That is, were some themes endorsed more than other themes? When discussing the themes in the subsequent section, it is very helpful to include how many people endorsed a particular item. For example, instead of saying 'The managers expressed the need for...' replace with 'Nearly half of the managers...'. As it is currently written, it is too vague.

- page 10, in the 'To teach' section, this entire paragraph doesn't flow or make a lot of sense. Need to revise.

- page 14: In the 'Possible caller explanations' section, I find this section confusing. The authors need to situate the discussion of the findings within the context of how the data were collected. That is, how many managers stated these opinions? And how can the managers even make these statements if it is assumed they were not the ones actually taking the calls? Need to clarify how the managers came to these conclusions.

- page 11: In 'The managers' views on health promotion' section, give the exact number instead of stating 'as many as 14 of the 23 SHD managers...'. It would serve this paper well to more clearly define the difference between 'health promotion' and 'teaching'. Some researchers would argue that there is considerable overlap in these concepts but it seems that the authors of the present study are considering them to be quite distinct.

- page 15: In the Possible telenurse explanations', this section seems very speculative. Without telling the reader what question was asked to the managers, it is assumed that managers are simply making assumptions about telenurses.

Minor Revisions

1. Abstract
   - the sentence '... aim of the study was to explore..' Should change the word 'hold' to a more appropriate descriptor. The second sentence in the Conclusions section is awkward and should be revised.

2. Introduction
   - page 3, paragraph 2: Be consistent when writing numbers.
   - page 3, paragraph 2: Need a reference for third sentence and this sentence is awkwardly worded.
   - page 3, paragraph 2: last sentence, need to explain why health promotion can ensure long-lasting value.
   - page 5, paragraph 1: too many 'thus' statements.

3. Methods
   - page 6: What is the RATS guidelines? Avoid jargon please and give reference.
   - page 6: Makes more sense to present Study Participants before the Procedure.
   - page 6: In Study Participants, are there any demographics of the sample to report? Other than gender, the reader has no idea who was included (e.g., age).
4. Results
- page 9: In the 'To achieve patient safety' section, the authors need to clarify what they mean by 'an appropriate levels means the lowest (i.e., cheapest) effective treatment level.'
- page 10: In the 'To assess, refer and give advice' section, I think there is a missing word in the first sentence. Perhaps the word 'theme' or 'topic' should appear after 'recurring'. ('...were frequently recurring themes in the managers' descriptions...').
- page 11, paragraph 2: The primary mission of the SHD should be stated in the Introduction to provide context.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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