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Reviewer's report:

General
Interesting article and important topic. Wish the authors had expanded much more on cultural factors and role of women in a muslim culture. The code of ethics by ICN are written for a western audience and take little account of other religions and closed political systems. The authors have explored the nurses views of advocacy and have generated interesting concepts. The examples for each concept is not always clear, see page 12 about the youg boy. My major concern is that the concepts are not abstracted enough, they remain very descriptive. Even when using Strauss and Corbins' version of GT the relationship between categories must be clarified. Interpreted data belong to the researchers and are never given back to informants for verification when using GT. The article uses a popular presentation form and lacks scientific stringency, almost is superficial. Page 15 points to the fact the nurses need more knowledge to be able to undertake an advocacy role, this is not a very innovative discovery........ The last paragraph, page 16 and 17 I think sums up this article but has not been highlighted through the article.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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