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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is well-written with an interesting and relevant topic that is applicable to practice in long term care. The phenomenon of interest was clearly discussed as capillary blood glucose measurements used in nursing home residents with diabetes. The purpose of the study was discussed as an exploratory qualitative study with three professional specific groups. The method of the study was discussed as a qualitative study. The sample method was identified. The authors' mention data collection, results, and discussed the findings from the participants in the focus groups. The narratives in the manuscript add to the quality of the study. The authors' discussed conclusions as well as implications and recommendations for the need to conduct more studies relating to this topic. A more in-depth explanation related to sections in the manuscript would assist those of us who do not practice in nursing homes. Specifically, if I may suggest the following:

1) The authors' credentials were not clearly identified. Is it possible to list the academic credentials after each author's name? This would eliminate the time and need to research each author as this reviewer did. This reviewer had to look up each author to find out each author's academic qualifications.

2) I assume a literature search was completed, however a literature search was not mentioned or discussed in the manuscript. 3) I assume a theoretical framework was used, however a theoretical framework was not mentioned in the manuscript.

3) I noticed references at the end of the manuscript, however not all of the references listed could be cross referenced. Perhaps the references that could not be cross referenced should be deleted from the reference section? This may detract from the validity of the study.

4) I am not familiar with the term "auxillary nurses", is it possible to provide a definition for this term?

5) I am not familiar with Malterud's principles of systematic text condensation, is it possible to provide an explanation or discussion relating to Malterud's principles so that readers may better understand this type of analysis?
6) In the manuscript the authors clearly mention the study was not subject to approval, however even if the study did not require approval from the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD), shouldn't all ethical standards be followed to protect the participants in this study? At this point, this reviewer is not convinced that all ethical standards were followed. At this time, I recommend the authors' to revise the manuscript based on the suggestions from this reviewer. I hope the authors' will find this review helpful. Thank you for allowing me the honor to review this study.

References used to guide this reviewer


Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Unable to assess

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