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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and actual study. I found these care centers very interesting and important, as well as nurses' perspectives and experiences working in places like these. Overall, the manuscript was ok but here are some comments that could help you to clarify some things and to improve the text.

Introduction:

1st line: "Depressive symptoms and depression are among the most common mental disorders in older people". Among what? I do not quite understand this. Among means together with something.

5th and 6th line: "However, it is not…", "the ability to treat it successfully…” What is the "it"? Depression? Depressive symptoms?

Line 31: "Registered nurses (RN) work closely with patients." That is obvious, but do you mean here patients in general or older people as clients?

The introduction is informative. However, registered nurses' tasks and roles at these CCOPs could have been explained more detailed. Are there other health care professionals involved at all? Also, are there any research done about other perspectives, such as patients'/clients' experiences of CCOPs that you could refer?

Design and methodology:

What kind of interviews were conducted? Structured? Semi-structured? Open? Did you use any theoretical or philosophical framework to guide your work? For example phenomenology?
Data collection:
Where and with whom the central question was pilot tested?

Data analysis:
You mention Elo & Kyngäs earlier in the text but not here in the data analysis section. You should refer to the analysis stages here. Could you also consider adding a figure to illustrate your analysis, themes and subthemes?

Results:
The results chapter is quite long. The amount of quotations could be considered to be decreased. Now it is a bit difficult to catch the point.

Discussion:
You could start the discussion by repeating the main results/themes after the aim. The discussion is quite long. However, your discussion is relevant but a bit illogical.

Methodological considerations:
You discuss about the trustworthiness of the study. How about the generalizability and usefulness of the results? In addition, what are the strengths of this study?

Other comments:
The language is still a bit unclear here and there in the text.

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

Yes

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.

Yes

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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