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Reviewer’s report:

This paper examines nurses' perceptions of the feasibility of an educational intervention focused on increasing awareness of one's own cultural features. The manuscript has some promise, but in its present form is not suitable for publication.

MAJOR

1. The paper is presented as a feasibility study, but it is both difficult to determine how feasibility was assessed, and the assessment of feasibility is insufficient. The author categorically describes the types of questions as in part asking participants about the feasibility, but does not specify what aspects of feasibility were explored. Having the specific questions would be helpful. However, based on the categorization of the responses, it seems as if the study was limited to perceived utility by the potential participants. The methods presented are insufficient to determine if this intervention will work. Feasibility assessment appears to be limited to acceptability. This is potentially reasonable, but the paper should be framed as such, and then broader evaluation of acceptability should be addressed beyond satisfaction and utility. Areas of further exploration for acceptability could be intent to use, fit with organizational culture, Perceived positive or negative effects on organization (Bowen et al., 2009, American Journal of Preventative Medicine).

2. Insufficient detail is given regarding the intervention. The author describes that educational content was based on theoretical literature but does not describe this connection. There are other references to the development of content of the intervention, but it is described in broad terms with no specifics about how pre-intervention interviews were conducted. Is this information published elsewhere? If not, it should be described in a bit more depth. Constructivism was chose as a pedagogical approach, but needs to be described for the reader, including how this was used in the development of the intervention. The intervention itself is not described. A section titled "intervention" should be included, with at least a paragraph describing the intervention itself. For example, what are the web-based tasks? Can you give an example of the storytelling?

3. Because each quotation is analyzed with its own explanation, the analysis lacks synthesis. I suggest writing out your themes, and then providing at most one or two exemplars for each one, with the remaining data in a table, organized by theme.
4. Descriptions of each quote in the results section take liberties with interpretation that are not supported by the data. For example the author writes "participants were also pleased that many of the real-life examples presented in the lectures were not from the healthcare environment..." There is no data suggesting that they were pleased. If they do not state being pleased you cannot assume their state of mind. You can report that they stated that they were pleased, but in this case they did not. They stated that the presentation of the data was useful.

5. The conclusions are not all supported by the data. For example, in the discussion you write that "despite their prior experiences, participants were extremely satisfied with the educational intervention." What prior experience? I also did not see data that contrasted participants' prior experiences to the current experience.

6. Overall the writing strays from scientific style in several places. As referred to in #4, the author needs to refrain from editorialization, imprecise word choice, and over interpretation of data, throughout the paper.

**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.

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.

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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