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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? No it was actually a little difficult to understand what this study was looking at. I think a clearer explanation on knotmaking would help in the background section. Finally then the question would be do NPs use knotmaking to facilitate IP care of patients in acute and long-term-care facilities.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes the methods are appropriate and well described.

3. Are the data sound? Yes it appears so but again with out a clearer understanding of knotmaking hard to say if they are truly sound.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Yes the figure is fine.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes one grammar error use of There instead of their.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes but again there was manythings about knotmaking in the discussion that needed to come first so that the reader has a better understanding of what it is and how NPs use it to foster IP care of their patients.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? No but this may be NA.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No some clarification is needed… knotworking is … by … used here to evaluate IP care… found … etc.

10. Is the writing acceptable? Yes somewhat fragmented at times causing the reader to re-read it but again this may just be due to the fact that I truly did and still am not sure I understand knotmaking and why it was used in this study.

Major Compulsory Revisions – I truly think that the authors should give the readers some more up front (either in the back ground or do a section on theoretical underpinnings of knotmaking ) of what knotmaking is and why it was used in this research. From there explain how this new” brief interactions form” works and how it modifies the theoretical underpinnings of this work and how it supports IP. Overall a very interesting study that I think would be worthy of
publishing once this is fixed.

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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