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Reviewer’s report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

None

• Minor Essential Revisions

1. p6 please clarify whether this should be ‘ensuring’ or ‘ensuing’ retirement
2. p14 clarify the data source of the statement about equipment e.g. “where, according to nurses interviewed, equipment was often better .... than in the UK”.
3. p22 where is the evidence to support the statement that experience in the UK helps on the next step to the US? This should be included in the Results section, if available. It is important as a finding about another type of ‘stepping stone’ used by migrants.
4. p25 The final statement is only appropriate if there is evidence that the NHS is recruiting from other countries where they are greatly needed. The fourth sentence in the background section (p4), supported by reference #6 implies that there might be a problem. However, the case would be strengthened with up-to-date data (such as registration data) which showed that countries with shortages were still providing recruits to the UK.

• Discretionary Revisions

1. p5 1800s (no apostrophe)
2. p5 Because pull factors are an important part of the conceptual framework being used, it is better to use recognised academic references. Reference #31 might be better replaced by a published and preferably peer-reviewed reference as these are available.
3. p21 no commas needed in the last sentence (beginning “The fact that ...”)
4. p22 “however” fits better in the second sentence about Filipina nurses: “However, Filipina nurses in this study ...
5. p22 “… IRNs as a heterogeneous group” is probably more accurate

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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