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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

First of all, I would like to thank and congratulate the author(s) for submitting the manuscript.

I have few comments which require amendment prior to recommendation for publication:

i. Abstract -

-Please refine the intro, and about the "resource-limited setting". -Methods; seven hospitals in Finland? Which department? When was the data collection?

-Results; "Nurses with bachelor's degree scored significantly higher than the nurses at the diploma and certificate (95% CI = 7.1-16.7 and 9.4-19.1; p &lt;0.001) respectively." - knowledge/ attitude/ Perceived Barriers?

-"The highest perceived barriers to adequate pain management in emergency departments were overcrowding of emergency department, nursing workload, lack of protocols for pain assessment and lack of pain assessment tools" - Please write the value/ score for each variables.

-The conclusion should reflect to the results (implications).

ii. Introduction - Please write some info regarding nurses' role of pain management in their country particularly in the emergency department, their local scenario (in Finland)
iii. Methodology -

- Please provide sample size calculation
- Please explain the reasons, why the hospitals/ the emergency departments were chosen, explain about "resource-limited setting"
- What was the sampling technique used?
- When the date (month/year) of data collection?
- Inclusion criteria - please explain further (e.g., did all nurses involved? How about the nurse manager? / nurses who not doing any clinical work)
- Ethical consideration and Procedure - okay
- NKASRP tool - Please explain about the scale (e.g., Multiple Choice, Likert Scale), the scoring of mean (SD) value (in the result)
- Data analysis - any normality test done for the continuous data/ variables prior of data analysis?

vi. Results

- Table 2 - Items of knowledge (alone) or combination of knowledge and attitude
- Table 3 - Level of knowledge (alone) or combination of knowledge and attitude
- "Similarly, an independent t-test showed a significantly higher mean score of nurses who had previous training regarding pain management compared to those who had no previous training (95% CI = 1.82-8.99; p = 0.003)." - Please reconfirm the result (Table 3)
- "Pearson's correlation analysis revealed that emergency nurses' perceived barriers are significantly and positively correlated with their knowledge level (r = 0.257, p = 0.004)." - please provide the knowledge level (mean and SD) in the descriptive results

v. Discussion

- "nurses who reportedly had previous training regarding pain scored significantly higher knowledge level than those without previous training.", also discussed in Page 20 - please reconfirm about the result
"This severe deficit in knowledge and attitude of Eritrean nurses might have arisen from the lack of attention given to pain assessment and management courses in the nursing schools." - should have more comparison with other previous studies so that we know how the respondents in this study performed

"The result showed that nurses with higher knowledge level regarding pain management were more barriers cautious than those who scored lower knowledge level." - please discuss further about this, also the r value was 0.257 (small association)
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If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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