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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript provides an interpretive descriptive analysis of rural nursing care delivery by public health nurses for mothers engaged in the Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP) program in British Columbia (BC), Canada. The aims of this study were a spin-off of a larger randomized control study in BC which is evaluating the outcomes of the NFP delivery. Process evaluation data was used to explore the influence of rurality in the delivery of the NFP in BC. I found the manuscript interesting to read, and the analysis overall was clear and appeared credible. However, there were some sections of the background in particular that were lengthy, that would benefit from tightening up to make more concise. Specifically, I would reduce a good bit of the parent study background, and extensive discussion of the rural PHNs. It is important to state the aim of this paper before page 8. Under the methods: please discuss more specifically what is distinct about interpretive descriptive design, and how the analysis was conducted--understanding that many readers do not know the language of qualitative analysis and it may sound vague. Explain what is meant by conceptual leap. What was the background of the qualitative analysts, and how did this influence or bias the findings? The presentation of results and discussion was well organized and a strength of the manuscript. The paper makes a nice contribution to the literature on rural nursing practice in the context of the NFP.
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