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Reviewer's report:

This wide ranging discussion obscures some of the interesting points that this manuscript provides. I would recommend shortening the manuscript significantly and focusing on the unique findings, rather than belaboring the many points that your subjects made that are well recognized.

First, your subjects, administrators and nurses, are a unique source and this should be emphasized.

Second, why did you pick those two principles from Emanuel et al? Some explanation for the choice is important.

Third, concentrate on the insights your subjects had which are unique. For example, the following sections bring new information forward: Ways of fostering collaboration between partners; the six dimensions of social value that include intrinsic as well as instrumental value; the roles the entire research team have such as who is responsible for disseminating research, for translating to clinical practice and public policy. This latter is important since so many focus just on the roles of the ethics committees and clinical investigators. Your data highlights the importance of all the varied roles.

A much shorter manuscript, focused on new insights from your unique subject population would be a great improvement.

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.

Unable to assess
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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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