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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. It is always interesting to read research about visiting or public health nurses. However, in my view this manuscript requires major revision to be of a quality to be published in an international nursing journal. I outline the points from my critical appraisal of this paper which I hope will assist the authors.

Please note that I am not a statistician and the manuscript also requires review by a statistician.

The paper needs revision throughout for correct and grammatical written English e.g. page 7 line 7 " The visiting nurses who expressed their willingness to join in this study were participated" .

Please check that all cited material is in the references e.g. Min & Lee (page 7 has no reference.

Abstract: This requires a complete re-write in the light of my comments below on the paper.

Manuscript

This paper would benefit from a brief introduction paragraph prior to the background to outline the issues and the research questions.

Background.

As currently written this paper is missing an introduction to the concept of "cultural competence" in health care, why it is considered important in health care systems internationally and to what extent it is considered important in the South Korean health care system. The sentence on page 4 line 42 referenced to a book on multicultural counselling competencies is not sufficient. This needs to be addressed. I would anticipate this element would reference theorists and researchers of health care such as Leininger (e.g. Leininger M. Transcultural Nursing: Theories, Concepts and Practices. New York, NY: Wiley; 1978), Betancourt (Betancourt, J.R.,

Likewise the concept of 'empathy' and its relationship to 'cultural competency' (page 5 line 34 -51 ) requires some enlargement in relation to the research evidence.

The paper as currently written in missing any review of research of the 'cultural competence ' of nurses and particularly those providing visiting services (public health and primary health care ). The statement in Page 5 line 54 does not provide this evidence . Consequently it is not evident to the reader what gap in knowledge is being addressed by this research. This paper requires a review of the relevant research.

As currently written the paper is missing any research questions and objectives. These need to be included.

This paper as currently written provides no information about the South Korean health care system (e.g. how is it funded , who does it cover ). This needs to be included briefly. In particular, information about the 'visiting nurse' service is minimal and not clear (page 4 ). For an international reader more detail as to who these are, what service they provide (e.g. do they just give advice and treatment as directed by a doctor or can they prescribe medicines?) and to which groups in the population (e.g. old people with chronic illness and/or primary preventative health care to mothers and babies ?) Can you give other terms used for such nurses in other countries that would help the reader understand the role of this group of nurses? This type of contextual information needs to be briefly included.

I now address some specifics

page 3 lines 30 -35 . The statement " in contrast to other multicultural nations that are derived primarily from family immigration" is not evidenced and inaccurate - see for example different
ethnic groups in countries such as India, China and most African countries and indigenous peoples in countries like the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand. You will need to define your terms more clearly so that the reader can follow your arguments.

Page 3 line 45 The reader will need a bit more explanation as to the South Korean situation and why there are 'international marriages' predominantly in rural areas, why they are poor with low life satisfaction.

Page 5 line 30 and 31 In many countries multi-cultural families would not be judged as 'vulnerable' this needs more explanation in the South Korean context.

Page 5 line 59 'confront' is not usually the term used when visiting nurses meet their patients and families.

Methods
Page 6 line 25 needs to include that the method was a self report survey (paper or electronic?). The rationale for choosing this design and method is absent and needs to be included.

Page 6 There needs to be a rationale for the population of visiting nurses included in the sample and to what extent they were representative of all Korean visiting nurses.

Page 6 line 32 "lots of multicultural population" needs to be replaced with a more accurate description, preferably a referenced percentage.

Page 6 line 32 there appears to be one inclusion criteria. Could all inclusion and exclusion criteria be included?

Page 6 line 35 There is a power calculation for a sample size (this sentence needs attention as it is not correctly written) but there has been no hypothesis given or research questions to explain why you need this, or the difference or equivalency that you are testing for? This needs to be addressed.

Page 6 and 7. There is no statement of ethical review of this study in this section but I note an full explanation is given in the declarations.

Measures
An English version of the measures should be included as a supplementary file. There needs to be an explanation as to why these specific measures were chosen, particularly as there are so many available. In particular a defence needs to be made as why you chose the

Data analytic strategy.
This should link to the research questions.
Explain how missing data were addressed.

Results
This should start with a description of participants i.e. number potentially eligible, number completing the survey, number analysed.
The description of the participants could be shortened to a key point linked to your research questions given that all data is in Table 1.
It is not clear to the reader how judgements have been made or compared with what to make statements e.g. p10 line 32 "mean item of 3.07 which is relatively high"

Discussion
This needs substantial revision in order to help the reader follow the argument. It should start with a brief summary of the findings and then be compared to other research literature to describe how it confirms that literature and/or adds new knowledge both for those in South Korea but to the international literature. Much of the current discussion is very wide ranging about possible implications but does not seem grounded in the evidence from this study.
The limitations and strengths of this study need to be discussed more clearly. I couldn't find them although some emerge for example page 17 lines 17-30 which suggest your survey tools on cultural competency did not include all possible variables - this should then link back as to why you chose these tools.
The study was conducted over 5 years ago - there needs to be some discussion as to the relevance of the data /evidence now.

Conclusions
I suggest this needs to link back to your research question in some way rather than only offer implications.

Declarations
The authors declare funding in 2017 but the study was conducted in 2012. There needs to be some explanation.

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

**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.
No

**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.
I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.