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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Maybe - with major revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: A well conceived qualitative study of modern human resources issues in delivering good quality care to older adult populations. You've done well with identifying common themes across countries. Would help to have more structure in the presentation of the results also - it feels more like outcomes were cherry-picked, without the reading having access to insights from each of the respondent groups for each thematic area/question. These then should carry through into the discussion to bolster argument for supportive regulatory structure. Nowhere did you mention the training curriculum or efforts to accredit/standardize that as a mechanism to address the concerns about skill sets and competence.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Need more details about the analysis - including whether multiple individuals reviewed the same interviews and agreement between them about how to categorize "units". The discussion mentioned group discussions about content and meaning - which is good, but more details about this should be included in the methods section. Readers may not be aware of the differences between Scandanavian and Nordic - and the conclusions a challenge to interpret because the readers may not know the similarities and differences in health care systems and mechanisms of care delivery between the selected countries - especially, as if stated in the discussion, decision making is at the state and/or municipal levels. Given this - the paper would also benefit from the authors stating more clearly how single respondents in each of the respondent groups may or may not represent the situation across the respective country.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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

No

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

No
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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