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Reviewer's report:

The paper addresses a topic of relevance to nurse educators involved in the design and implementation of clinical courses with a focus on the care of older adults residing in long term care settings. Overall, the study is well conceived and the results are clearly and meaningfully presented.

There are few points to clarify:

It would be helpful to readers who are not quite familiar with long term care staffing complement, to explain the pairing of students with health care aides, when describing the placement.

There is limited information on the innovative or new placement; its distinctive features and how they differ from the usual placement are not obvious. A more detailed description would be important. Further, it is not quite clear if the data collected and the results presented derive from interviews with both groups of students (new and usual placement groups). In case the data are both groups, then it would have been useful to compare the themes across groups to highlight the unique contribution of the new placement to students' learning. Otherwise, it may be a bit confusing to mention the two groups but report the results pertaining to one only.

What were the questions asked in the focus group sessions held with the different categories of participants (i.e. students, staff, residents, instructors)? It would help to list the main questions in order to contextualize the findings.

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

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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