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Manuscript: Mastery Learning in a Bachelor's of Nursing Program: The Roseman University of Health Sciences Experience

This is an important and interesting study. However, there are some issues I would like you to clarify:

Abstract:
There was not any objective of the study in the abstract at all.

Background:
Lines 74-77: what are the program outcomes?
Lines 87-88: Should there be a reference? How do you know that most nursing education is like that, not mastery learning?
Lines 90-92 needs a reference.
Lines 111-113 needs a reference.
Line 132-134: You mention that the mastery learning is the best method for educating health professionals but earlier you said that there is little nursing literature about these programs in lines 72-73. How can you know that it is the best for nursing education if there is only little evidence of it?

Methods:
What is the design of this study?
The American nursing education system could be explained in the beginning because readers in Europe has difficulties to understand how your nursing education is built in general.
Line 149: what is GPA and what does GPA of 2.75 means?
Line 151: What is the maximum score of TEAS?

Data collection and analysis:
This chapter could be a bit more informative and detailed. The data analysis should also be explained more detailed. Also, did you use a statistician and what program you used for the statistical analysis?

Results:
The results are not in line with the aim of the study in page 5, lines 74-77. For example, what were the lessons learned?
Discussion:
The standards of NCLEX could be explained shortly because in Europe, we do not have such system.
There could be more discussion about the results and how can these results be used in nursing education. You should also refer your findings more with the previous literature to strengthen the discussion.

Limitations:
What are the limitations and strengths of this study? In addition, could these results be generalized into other universities/countries etc.?

Conclusions:
Based on the methods, analysis and results of this study, the conclusion is too straightforward. There are certain limitations in this study that could only suggest that this teaching method is working. More research is needed.

Tables:
Could you also add the credits of each course to the table 2, so that the reader knows what the extension of each course is?

Other:
This study was conducted in the USA. It was a bit difficult for a European reader to follow it because the education system is quite different here in Europe. You should explain your nursing education system a bit more to make your article easier to understand for those who are not familiar with the education system in USA.

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.
I recommend additional statistical review

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