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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Please review and the revised manuscript, ‘A comparison of trends in research into home care services in Japan and Korea’, for publishing at BMC Nursing.

This manuscript is revised under valuable comments
Reviewer: Hiroshi Mikami
Comments and Revised as follows:

#1. In Conclusion of the abstract the authors state, “it is suggested that future collaboration be undertaken to further improve the diversity of research design and method especially”, but in Conclusion of the text there is no word of ‘collaboration’. => The authors were added in conclusion into in Conclusion of the text as the reviewer’s comment. Furthermore, the phrase, ‘to further improve the diversity of research design and method’ is not clear and will be puzzled => To clear understand, change into “It is suggested that future collaboration be undertaken to improve the variety of research design and method especially in both countries under the aged society.

#2. It is suggested that as a method of comparison they might use the Impact Factor as an indicator of the quality of articles. At least it should be mentioned whether it was considered or not. => Considered IF at first, but it’s better no comments on that because there are no IF Journal not only Japan but also Korea of some.

#3. There are minor problems as listed below.
1. The manuscript was changed into ‘compare the research trends’ as the comments
3. In Methods, 6 lines above Results, meaning of the sentence “However, MeSH terms in both countries do not use exactly could see that.” is not clear and should
be corrected. => We changed into more clearly like this “However, MeSH terms as the keywords in both countries do not show exactly by authors originally. Therefore, we applied the most appropriate alternative to compare, which was to analyze the keywords presented by the authors.”

4. In Conclusion, line 3 to 4. ‘of home care services’ at the end of the sentence should be deleted because it is repeated. => we deleted.

Reviewer: Jun Hasegawa
Comments and Revised as follows:

#Major compulsory revision

1) Background 1st sentence (According to~), no Japanese ratio of them are not shown => The author added Japanese statistics and reference like as: “In 2010, the elderly ratio in Korea was 10.2% compare in Japan was 23.1%, this is expected to rise to 14.3% in Korea and 28.4% in Japan by 2018. By contrast, the 2010 total fertility rate in Korea was 1.13 and in Japan was 1.39, which is the lowest value in the world at the time of writing [2, 3].

2) Method 1st sentence (Although home care services~): Why articles classified under geriatric nursing were excluded? Criteria finally extracted from journal of 37 of Japan and of 22 of Korea to four and three, respectively should be shown intelligibly. => In Korea, Home care services not belong to geriatrics nursing but belong to community health care. Therefore, the authors changed the sentence to better clear like as: All academic journals relating to home care services and all publications relating to community health nursing studies published the year of 2004 to 2008 in Japan and Korea were considered for inclusion in the present literature review.

And There are 4 main journals relating to home care services were selected for consideration in the present study in Japan, such as, Journal of Japan Academy of Nursing Science (JJANS) [7]; Journal of Japan Society of Nursing Research (JJSNR) [8]; Journal of Japan Academy of Community Health Nursing (JJACHN) [9]; and Journal of Japan Academy of Home Care (JJAHC) [10]. Secondly, six academic journals relating to integrated community health nursing were chosen from the 22 academic journals of the Korean Society of Nursing Science. Of these, the following 3 main journals relating to home care services were selected for consideration in the present study in Korea:

#Minor Essential Revision

Result Research method: Change”table3” into “Table3”.