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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

thank you for this interesting and well made article. The topic of resilience and well-being of university nursing students is contemporary. The quality of the manuscript is good in general. I have just few comments/questions:

1 The article provides information of students studying in Hong Kong. I am wondering how would you argue the results to be in interest for international readers and researchers? I would consider whether you should mention the target group in the abstract at all (students in Hong Kong). Instead you could strengthen your premise, discussion and conclusions towards more international perspective. What new does this study produce in addition to information specific to students in Hong Kong?

2 Keywords: I would add nursing student and/or nursing education. Is Hong Kong adequate keyword (subject heading)?

3 In the background chapter, please check the logic in the paragraphs starting line 2 to 15 (academic and clinical setting and distress). Based on which source (reference) you argue there is extensive research on work stress and burnout among nurses? I would also like to read more about the differences between nursing and other disciplines (what disciplines or students).

4 In page 5, you compare the studying in Hong Kong versus Australia/Singapore. However, later in discussion you refer to studying in China? And I am wondering whether resilience and well-being has been studied in China by Smith et al. (reference number 30)?
5 To international audience, postgraduate studies usually means students who are already baccalaureate nurses and they then continue their studies (specialising education, advanced practice education etc). So first, I would like to know why you chose to have both undergraduate and postgraduate students? Second, I would like you to clarify the background of the undergraduate students. What type of previous education they usually have and clearly differentiate them from postgraduate students with previous baccalaureate nursing education?

6 I find a bit problematic the fact that you paid cash for the participating students. The topic of the study is not related to vulnerable people or such - so this might not be a problem. However, it is more of an issue in the ethical discussion and you should discuss that more.

7 In the study, you did not find any of the background factors explanatory for the differences between the under- and postgraduate students in relation to level of resilience. Later you discuss well more about the potential reasons. However, I wonder, would there be some factors which should be explored in the future in relationship with the resilience and well-being in your opinion?

8 The implications chapter has been made based on your opinions and experiences, and not evidence based (methods we can use to support resilience and well-being). I would recommend you to think of writing these more in "potentially effective method" manner. Maybe you in future studies will explore this relationship more? There is also quite extensive literature already existing in relation to resilience among students - maybe you could have commented some of those as a possible solutions?
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