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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is an interesting paper about the use of Namaste care in Canadian long-term care settings. The study and its aims are interesting and will be of use to clinicians and researchers working in this area. I have made some comments below that may be used to improve aspects of the paper.

Abstract:

The abstract is clear and concise. In the background section the authors could state that they mean quality of life instead of just stating quality as they use this in the rest of the abstract.

Background:

The background is well written with a good amount of background detail on the need for initiatives such as Namaste care. A few points outlined below would aid the background.

Line 23-26, page 5, the sentence needs re-written, as it does not make sense.

Some more information on the Namaste care intervention would be beneficial in the background section. I understand that the authors go into detail in the method section, however, are there variations on the intervention etc?

Methods:

The methods section provides lots of detail about the study. The design section however feels like there is too much procedural information in this section. This would be better situated in the procedure and participant sections.

On page 9, line 11 the authors state that as reminders project leaders and research assistants provided updates. What do the authors mean with as 'reminders'? Is this to remind staff to perform the Namaste care or to remind the family and residents that the sessions are available? Some clarification would be beneficial.

Pages 9 and 10, the mention of Table 2 and 3 here is not really needed as the factors used for assessing feasibility and fidelity are only being mentioned, not the results. I also cannot see a reference to Table 1 or figure 1 in text.
The authors claim that they carried out thematic content analysis, could the authors provide some more description of what this is and how it is usually analysed?

Findings:

The authors stated that t-tests were used to assess changes in outcomes, however there are no t-tests reported in the findings.

The acceptability findings, analysed by thematic content analysis, are not clear, what themes came out of the analysis? A description at the beginning of this findings section would help otherwise it is not very clear what the findings represent and how they came about. Better signposting or restructuring of this section might make this clearer.

Were the interviews and filed notes etc. analysed separately? The findings are presented separately in the results section however in the analysis section it is not very clear.

There were issues with needing to halt the programme due to infection outbreak and reduced length of some sessions. How was this accounted for in the findings since the percentage of sessions completed etc. were recorded and presented?

Discussion:

The discussion is in-depth and uses a lot of relevant literature.

In the discussion the authors mention they carried out an environmental scan. What do the authors mean by this? How was this conducted?

Grammatical/typographical errors:

In the abstract:
Line 13 should be 'the'. Line 39 should have an 'a' before quality of life improved

Background: Line 6, page 4, there is an extra comma and bracket.
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