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Reviewer's report:

This an interesting study, about work satisfaction across four CCUs, and differences between dedicated and hybrid CCUs. It is very well written using a wide range of solid evidences and using proficient academic style. I have some comments and questions that I would like to be answered before making any final decision:

Page 6. Line 2. For international readers it would be good if you explained what Dedicated CCUs are.

Page 6. Line 25. This is a double-sided argument. It seems reasonable to think that in CCUs the expertise level will be higher, but only in specific cardiac care. However, hybrid CCUs could provide a wider range of care since they include other kind of patients. It seems logical to me to move towards a hybrid model given the fact that cardiovascular diseases are becoming so prevalent.

Page 7. Line 26. all of this is to justify the need for dedicated CCUs? If so, the arguments provided do no clarify so. For example, the last argument is too generic, it does not clarify anything about acute care, ICU o CCUs. In line 31, when you say "inadequate nursing care following acute cardiac events..." do you mean in specialized units or in general wards?

Page 7. Line 36. is this a worldwide ratio? or a local one? It would be better to clarify this detail.

Page 7. Line 39. This whole paragraph seems to me more appropriate as a discussion, not as an introduction or background data.


Page 7. Line 42. You say, "There is a dearth of evidence about the specific…", but what is this evidence saying?

Page 7. Line 47. Aims usually appear at the end of the introduction, not in the methods section. If it is a norm in the journal do not pay attention to my comment.

Page 7. Line 48. What do you mean by "explore"? This a broad meaning verb usually associated to subjective issues or intentions. I know that this verb has been used in plenty of studies, but I
consider there are other verbs that may fit in better, being more specific (e.g. explain, describe, understand, etc.)

Page 7. Line 49. Do you mean you want to explore the differences between dedicated and hybrid CCUs? This sounds incorrect to me. The differences in terms of what? satisfaction? outcomes? Besides, differences can be measured so the verb "explore" does not fit in.


Page 8. Line 58. see my comment above about using the verb "explore"

Page 8. Line 64. do you really need these references here?

Page 8. Line 64. When you say "Dedicated CCU are defined as..." This is the kind of explanation I was asking at the beginning of the introduction.

Page 9. Line 84. This fact that the PPE Scale was validated in General Practice (not in cardiac units) should be considered as a limitation and discussed further in its specific section.

Page 9. Data collection. It is important to state who conducted the interviews. I guess the script of the interviews was built according to the domains of the scale, but, what if some new themes emerged? Did you adapt the content of the script according to new findings? Where the interviews took place? What kind of questions did you ask? Did you reach saturation? When (and how) did you know you had enough qualitative data to answer your aims? How did you manage anonymity and other ethical issues?

The length of the interviews must also be considered a limitation.

Page 10. Data analysis. Statistics look appropriate to me and are clear. The last sentence (lines 116-117) needs further explanation. Who conducted the analysis? How did you ensure rigor in your qualitative data analysis? Any reference about thematic analysis? I think this section would benefit if you explain a bit what thematic analysis is and how it is done.

Page 11. Results. Quantitative results look ok to me and you have interesting findings. However, qualitative results are too extensive. I don't really see the importance, or the benefits, one single 4 nurses focus group can offer.

Page 12. Line 169-171. I don't think this verbatim illustrates what you have said in the text.

Page 13. Lines 189-190. Is this the verbatim that fits the best here?

Page 13. Line 200. I would include a verbatim here

Page 15. Line 245-246. This verbatim does not fit with the above text
Page 17. Line 287-316. I think some of the content included in "handling disagreement and conflict" could be included in "teamwork" or "staff relationship with physicians". I understand that this is because you are using the same themes used in the PPE scale, but the content may sound a bit redundant. I would rewrite the three themes making them more integrative. Also, some verbatims are missing.

Page 20. Discussion looks very good to me. However, see my previous comments regarding limitations.

Page 22. Conclusion. You don't need to state the methods here again, so the first two lines are unnecessary. The same happens with lines 413-414, no need to state here the limitations. How would this study impact practice?
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