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General

The premise of this manuscript is an important one. During these times of healthcare turbulence and nursing shortage, obtaining nurses' views on their productivity is important and will contribute to nursing knowledge with regard to factors facilitating or impeding the nurses' productivity. It is especially essential for administrators and nurses to note when designing strategies to improve the work environment and clinical practices.

It is a qualitative study that is discussed relatively well. The main topic is related to nurses and their productivity and the authors have interviewed a number of nurses to obtain their lived experience of this topic. The interviews are transcribed and analyzed using content analysis approach. Ethical procedures are described. In general, the manuscript would benefit from some revisions.

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

A: In the methods section:
1- It is mentioned that a content analysis approach was conducted. I would suggest additional discussion regarding the data analysis piece and the method of content analysis, which used.

2- The authors wrote, “To maintain trustworthiness of the conclusions, Lincoln and Guba’s four criteria were used.” Please declare what you did to adhere each criterion.

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- In the Introduction: I suggest to add some descriptions related to the context of nursing practice in Iran.

2- The content of tables 2 and 3 are not fully covered at the result section. Please review the text to make it more consistent to the tables.

3- The meaning of total factor productivity (TFP) is not clear for the reader. Please clarify.

4- Some sentences are vague. [i.e. (nurses are often the largest human resource and play a major role in their success). … (To verify the validity of the number of informants, the volume of data, the achievement of saturation, sampling approach (maximum variant sampling) were used)]. It seems that it is the case of language problem in translating the manuscript from Iranian language. A number of typing errors and grammatical problems also exist that could be condensed with further editing.

5- The authors wrote, “Trustworthiness of study results was further enhanced when other researchers in the field were asked to review the results and the coding process. They checked a large amount of the transcripts of interviews and coded them. There was close agreement between the resultant coding achieved by a number of researchers”. Please clarify the amount of data were checked by the other researchers, the number of mentioned researchers, and the degree of
agreement and the method of calculation.

6- The authors reported “Most of the participants (77%) referred to productivity as a qualitative feature, while 46.15% of them implied both quantitative and qualitative…”. I think the form of reporting should be changed.

7- The last paragraph of the result section should be moved to the discussion: [The finding of this research has been presented in a diagram. The concepts within this diagram include systemic evaluation of staff numbers required, appropriate adequate and regulated…]

8- I think the word “purposive sampling” is more appropriate than the “targeted sampling.

9- In the discussion:
The first sentences of discussion are not inferred from the findings. These are the authors’ discussion and should be supported by the definition of productivity from the participants’ point of view. The participants defined productivity as being useful, beneficial, helpful and effective for patients” as well as “providing high quality nursing care”.

10- The difference of output and outcome also needed to be declared for the reader. [Discussion: line 2].

11- The authors also wrote, “Even though productivity has so far been considered by organizations and managers from a quantitative perspective (efficiency), nurses often emphasized the qualitative dimension and their own effectiveness.” The difference of efficiency and effectiveness also needed to be declared for the reader. [Discussion: lines 11 and 12].

12- The diagram of human resource system fascinating nurses’ productivity [at the end of manuscript] did not discuss well. The authors can delete it or should add some additional discussion in this regard.

13- I also suggest adding some discussion related to the study limitations [if any].

14- Some of the contents are repetitive. Please review the whole manuscript and try to omit the repetitive contents. It would make easier for the reader to follow the text.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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