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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

I really appreciated your manuscript which is focused on a relevant issue. The manuscript is well written, logical and sounding from the scientific point of view. I think that it may be useful to improve some section as following

a) among the background, there is a need for each root, to provide a good example. Readers may not be confident with the meaning of the concepts introduced and they may be helped my concrete or literature-based examples.

b) it is not full clear at the end of the introduction/background the research problem and how discovering new knowledge may be valuable both for clinicians and researchers.

c) moreover, I suggest to distinguish the study design from the participants (nurse and patient); specifically, I strong suggest to better support the rational of the purposeful sample (which is not mentioned in this manner) on the basis of which the unique nurse was selected.

d) there is a need to explain why this data has not been published before given that the data collection was performed around 10 years ago, may be this is a secondary analysis? Please provide an explanation or provide a sentence among the limitations. I do not think that patients and nurses are so different that the metaphors would be affected; however, there is a need to motivate why long time has been required to provide this publication.

e) I also suggest to describe better the figure one, which is not immediate in its meaning;

f) with regard the findings, these are well reported.

g) I also suggest to report among the conclusion more implications for practice (eg. patient education).

Great and interesting work; thank you for having given the opportunity to revise it
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

None

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal