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Reviewer's report:

General
I appreciated the opportunity to review this ms. I have not seen a review of the use of qualitative and mixed methods research in the health sciences as presented by this manuscript. It will provide useful benchmark data that can be reviewed periodically to assess the inroads that qualitative and mixed methods research have made in the health science journals.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1) Although this ms mentions the criteria for selecting the qualitative articles, no mention was made about the criteria for selecting the mixed methods articles. Definitions exist for mixed methods research, and one of these might be employed as the criteria for selecting the mixed methods studies.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1) The discussion section does not provide explanations for the findings of this study. For example, what explains why these studies were found mostly in nursing journals and so few in the high circulation journals?
2) The authors did not state any limitations. These should be addressed if space is available.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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