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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript presents results of a qualitative interview study performed on 15 nurses with different background. The objective was to derive their experience and perspectives regarding procedures prior to colonoscopy in children. The study was conducted in a single children's hospital in Sweden.

The research question is important and the exploration of perspectives of all actors involved in such procedures is a relevant and insufficiently studied topic.

Nevertheless, this paper needs to be highly improved, especially in terms of accuracy and specificity of reporting. Many information are missing, some are repetitive, which tends to cause the reader to get lost. The manuscript should be checked for English language. The lack of fluency of many sentences leads to a complete misunderstanding of their main content. Finally, there is a major issue regarding the selection of nurses for the study.

MAJOR COMMENTS.

ABSTRACT.

The abbreviation HCPs is used, but not defined.

INTRODUCTION.

P4, L13-15. "Previous studies have shown that IBD is present in the adolescent age group in 25 percent of the cases." Does it mean 25% of all IBD or 25% of all adolescents?

The introduction is long and not clear in that we never understand if the major focus was on parents' perspectives or HCPs' perspectives. Of course both are important to mention because it tells about having a good partnership, but main references are not clear in terms of who it concerns, or are more frequently referring to parents (P5, L13-15, 34-35, 37-40, 44-45, 47-49, 51-52, 56-57). This should be improved, or the text should be rewritten to be more in line with the objective. On the other side, important information is missing, if focusing on HCP; for example: what is in fact the expected role of HCP regarding the procedures? In various countries? As compared to Sweden (where it seems to be unclear - but the reader understand that
later in the manuscript). The rationale for the study would be clearer with that information being transparently stated.

P5, L2. "To consume two or four liters" of what? Please be more accurate.

P5, L23. "ibid" should be avoided when citing references. Please be accurate in your reporting.

P5, L36-37. "previous studies from other areas". Great, but which areas? Please be more accurate.

METHODS.

P6, L21-26: this refers to the objectives, thus should be switched in the introduction. L20-21 refers to the data analysis. Same comment. Please avoid unnecessary repetitions.

P6, L32-35. "The participants consisted of 15 HCPs from South Sweden". Please be more accurate, cite the Hospital, the city, etc. Same at P6, L54-55: "at this pediatric department". Which "this"?

P6, L35. The author mentioned a "strategic selection" to ensure to collect a broad range of experience. What does this mean? What was strategic here? It seems the selection was completely unspecified: P7, L16: The nurses could asked for participation, if they wanted. That may lead to sort of selection bias, and explain the results regarding the fact that those who answered may not have the expected experience, or at least kind of same and comparable experience with the tasks and procedures. There was no attempt to make a more refined selection.

How was the interview built? Was it a semi-structured interview, not structured at all? How was the interview grid defined?

Data analysis. L41-42. "In order to better understand HCPs' experiences of pediatric colonoscopy" could be deleted. Please focus on the data analysis. Obviously, this is to answer the study aim.

The description of the paragraph L41-59 is full of unnecessary details (were read and reread several times, the interview text was sorted into specific contents areas (?)), and should be more rigorous, focused on the essentials. Several details here seem to be related with the preparation of the interview grid (P8, L1-4). Please explain or order your information.

P6, L9-19. This paragraph is unclear. Please rewrite. What does "the credible essence of HCPs' experience" mean? Please avoid interpretations here, stay on describing the methods.

FINDINGS.
The first sentence is a summary of the findings. Should be deleted here, eventually put in the discussion section.

P8, L57: What does the abbreviation "Mdn" refer to? Please use standard terminologies! Median is med.

The parts on findings are very difficult to read, and should focus on key elements. First, no summary sentence was provided on the main themes that were extracted from the interviews.

The theme entitled "Procedure similar to an assembly line" is unclear to me. To what does it refer?

The paragraph under this theme was also hard to understand. The HCP identified colonoscopy as a usual procedure performed at this (which?) department. I don't understand this as an important information … that could be found through activity reports, no…? The overall problem here was that the context in which HCPs are working is unclear, but should have been stated somewhere at the beginning. Otherwise, why all those statements are important for the reader. If your focus is on children and colonoscopy, why talking about different degrees of medical diagnoses, and their priority, here? It is the responsibility of the researchers to focus on their goals.

What do the "IP" at the end of citation mean?

It seems that the theme 1 was based on only one citation. Please explain.

What about the HCPs' perspectives according to their experience? Was there a difference. Many times the text cited the children that do not perceive what is happening (ex. P12, L42). But does this observation refer to all ages?

It would be worth to change the order of the reporting themes. This could help to better understand the key findings.

The main information is the lack of knowledge of the illness and its symptoms from the HCP. This should be discussed first. Then the challenges surrounding information, responsibility, and the first theme.

DISCUSSION.

A summary of the main findings (eg, the main themes) is missing.

P15, L23-25. "Previous research shows that the professionals and patients do not always have similar thinking about how to provide care during different procedures". Is it really on how to provide care? How could patients act on this? Please explain, or detail what you meant under "providing care".
P16, main paragraph should be rewritten to improve the clarity of the text. Some sentences like "Previous research has also shown that both children as well as their parents experience when care is not individually" missed some terms or information.
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