This article aims to assist with addressing core competency and the fourth domain for higher learning for the nursing profession. While also providing support regarding the benefit of using engaging teaching methodologies to enhance student learning

The title is suitable An alternative title that may reflect closer to the manuscript is: Fostering Connections and Engagement: Graduate nursing students' perspective of the role of peer review in Asynchronous Research Courses

clarify the type of student (ie. what semester were these students in the program? was this their first research course?

The author should read through the manuscript again and make sure they are using consistent language throughout the manuscript. In some sections of the manuscript author refers to "synchronous formats" others refers to "accelerated flexible course formats" then refers to compressed online course" also uses "shortened courses" this can be confusing. Also, use of all jargon should be removed from the manuscript and replaced with academic language.

Recommend proof reading the manuscript again to improve the clarity of the information presented, as the content is important to the nursing profession and academia, however the Materials and Methods section is a little confusing. Restructuring sentences can improve this section. Include as much detail as possible to assist reader with understanding this section.

Introduction- see comments as to where you should add citations. Remove and change non-academic language You mentioned deeper learning- how did you evaluate if this teaching strategy contributed to deeper learning? How did you measure this outcome, was it only what the students reported or was there comparison of what students reported compared with faculty comments and scores on the paper? This is not clear in the manuscript METHODS AND MATERIALS Design: Participants and Setting: Clarify in this section how many participant discussion board narratives were reviewed and were in the program of study was this research course offered. Pedagogical Procedure: consider restructuring / editing this section to improve clarity of the information and to improve the academic language. You mention that the papers and comments

were emailed back to original authors, how was the emails with the comments kept confidential? Pedagogical Procedure: How did the students receive the peer's paper and rubric? was it in the LMS or by email also. Pedagogical Procedure: Were the students provided any guidance/instructions on how to use the rubrics, how to give constructive peer feedback prior to the assignments? Pedagogical Procedure: Analysis: Clarify this statement. Was it 10 randomized post from each researcher (total of 30) or was it 10 overall? Consider rewording to improve clarity Results: When writing this section make it clear that the results from the narratives are the perspective of the students. Explain the reasoning behind how you chose to report your results. Some of the data is reflective of 15 randomized narratives and other times you reported the results of 105 narratives. However, there is no previous explanation. What is the rationale for reporting the data this way. Earlier in the manuscript you mentioned evaluation of 10 randomized post, there is no documentation supporting how you analyzed the data in this manner.

Discussion: You should include some of the limitations of this study

There is one reference that is greater than five years old and one that is 5 years old. The other references are appropriate