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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
2.2. Methods: First dot point: Line 1. The mention of ‘trend’ requires a statement of the period – over what time?
2.8. Outputs from Private Nursing Education Institutions: 4th Para. Not sure if this is a continuing reference to the Philippines – and/or how that juxtaposes with the mention of SA in the last half of the sentence.
Para 6. The mention of the more esoteric concern for private institutions not imbuing a sense of public service is not supported by evidence in this paper – it’s speculative and perhaps should be omitted.

Minor Essential Revisions:
2.3. Number of nurses produced (p5). Para 1 last sentence. This statement could be read as a failure of the literature review – but it does not achieve a definitive statement as to whether or not private sector training of professional nurses had occurred in South Africa.

Discretionary Revisions:
2.9. Utilisation of Nurses Graduating from Private Nursing – insert Education – Institutions. Para 1. The mention of ‘no clear evidence ….in terms of training curriculum and orientation to national health systems’ – is to be expected as there was no mention of curriculum review among the research questions listed in method. The closest question was one of demand but it is not presented as related to curriculum review and the orientation of curricula to the national health systems.
2nd sentence. ‘lack of evidence regarding the responsiveness of these nurses’……… (who are ‘these’ nurses)? The comment about it being ‘questionable ……add value to the labour market and health care education system’ are also somewhat outside the methods of the paper. While it is reasonable to raise the question, the use of the word ‘questionable’ imparts a pejorative (negative) value that is not supported or refuted by the evidence in this paper.
2.11. Conclusions: First sentence: While it may be ‘indisputable’ there is little evidence in this paper to support the claim in its entirety. (It makes sense intuitively – but no evidence or reference is provided to support the claim).
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