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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?

The questions posed by the authors are well defined and understandable. This information is important and deals with an area not previously well understood.

2. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The authors have designed an approach to yield sound data. The use of the mixed methods yielded important new insights.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?

There are two levels of interpretation here – one quantitative and one qualitative. The quantitative interpretation is straightforward and from the data. I do have questions about the qualitative interpretation. There does not seem to be any grounding in the extant literature for the findings reported. The authors do not report how they assured rigour for their findings. This is important as a measure of their work. I would suggest that some additional work is required here.

4. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?

The authors provide appropriate descriptions of their methods. A question arose as to just how only 8 of the 50 individuals who reported that they would participate further were selected. Maximum variation sampling was the goal but it is not clear if all of this was achieved. For example, did data saturation occur with the sample?

5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?

The methods are quite strong. The only potential weakness that I was able to find is the need to ground the results of the qualitative analysis in the extant literature. There is a bit of a reference to this in which there is a concern that perhaps existing quantitative tools do not adequately capture the findings here of this type of nursing practice.

6. Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?

This is well written and organized. Tables and figures are fine.
Minor Essential Revisions
I have no recommendations here.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
Reporting how rigor was assured for the qualitative analysis.

Discretionary Revisions
None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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