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Reviewer's report:

The study issue is important for health personnel, but some changes and additions should be made in the manuscript.

My recommendations are as follows:

Method

Design

"The present study is part of a larger cross-sectional study investigating various aspects of two supervision models in a comparative mixed-method approach. Quantitative data gathered by means of questionnaires have been supplemented with focus group interviews (students and preceptors) and log books (from students). In this study, results from the student questionnaires are presented."

Have the qualitative results of the study been published? It should be referred to here. If this is a mixt method work, is it better to publish all the results together?

Page 5- Two supervision models

Model A and model B should be explained in more detail in this section.

Page 5-6 Sample characteristics and procedures
How did the students decide which group they would be in?

Was randomization done?

How was the number of students determined? Has power analysis been done?

This section needs to be written more clearly.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and supervision conditions of nursing students

There are numerical errors on the table. for example; Hospital setting. the sum of the percentages is 101? All tables from this perspective should be reviewed

Page - 6 Measures

Cronbach alpha values of the scales used in this research should be given together with the references

What the high or low score means in the scales used?
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.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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