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Reviewer's report:

An interesting study. My feedback as follows;

- The themes seem very concrete in nature, like categories. Consider if this best describes a categorical analysis.
- P4, para 1, what is origin of the conceptual model? was it designed by the authors?
- P4, para 2 the background is very long and should be reduced in length. It should also be applicable to the broader nursing audience at the beginning then channel down to the evidence in Ghana to identify the gap in the literature and justify the study. To do this the authors would need to add for example, 'In some settings' nurses support patients financially.... and on page 5 in relation to care for abandoned babies.
- P4 line 46 should read 'severely ill', line 51, suggest, listen to their concerns
- P5 line 9, additional to what?, line 14 less threatening than whom? located at several places- sounds odd, need to explain about direct bedside care 24/7 here I suggest.
- P5 line 31 describe patient deterioration as opposed to sudden changes. The last paragraph of page 5 is a mixture of ideas and I suggest delete.
- P6 Middle paragraph reads very much like a list of points, need to improve the flow.
- P7 remove last 8 words of second line. The personal journey of the first author does not belong in the body of the paper.
- P7 Design, at the end of the paragraph, there is reference to a phenomena. I dont think it is and would remove this part of the sentence.
- P7 setting- explain the choice of wards and departments from which participants were invited, it seems an unusual mix.
- P7 sampling needs further explanation, were 15 purposively sampled and interviewed and then coincidentally saturation was reached? Or how did it happen?
- P8 What questions were asked of the participants?
- P8 Trustworthiness- verbatim quotes were actually the data, they were provided as examples of the what participants reported.
- P9 Try not to repeat, 15 participants appears 3 times.
- P9 Nurse traits-What is meant by they were nurturing and orientated? Explain navigation in this context.
- P10 and P15- please remove the sections on treating children whose parents refused treatment to uphold children's rights. Page 10 seems very much like the background (P5)
- P10 Theme/category empathetic should be empathy
- P11, last quote for Empathy doesnt quite fit.
- P12 Ethical ? Ethical practice, but the examples are not on this theme, its more about safe practice I suggest - review this section.

Describe the data analysis procedure and who was involved.

Discussion- line 33 better advocates than whom? All points in the discussion need to arise from the data-what are the origins of the points on critically ill patients, work related stress, for example? See also page 18.
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