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Reviewer's report:

General

Thank you for sending me this paper to review. The paper is clearly written. The background literature is adequately reviewed and a good case is made for the study. The correct procedure for translation-back translation appears to have been followed. The statistics seem appropriate. At one point p = 0.001 has been expressed as p = 0.000 which is course meaningless.

My only reservation concerning this paper is the response rate for the main study. It is not clear what percent of the nurses actually returned qrs. The authors need to state this information explicitly at the beginning of the Results section. Cheryl Hicks has been writing about TNA for some years and has developed expertise in the area. However, a major weakness in many of her published papers is the extremely poor response rate (as low as 22% in one paper). This casts doubt on the validity of the findings. I would not consider publishing this paper until response rate was clear and shown to be adequate.
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Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
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Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)