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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Please include further details on methodology, such as the suspected reason for low response rate, limitations of such a small sample and sampling technique applied. Assume that interviews were recorded and transcribed, but this is not stated. How were the interviews coded?

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   See above

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Once the limitations are made explicit, yes.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

This is a generally very well written paper which complements existing literature on nurse migration by reporting on migration intention. I have made a number of comments, which I hope, are clear and will be helpful in improving the quality of the paper.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical
mistakes, errors in interpretation.

1. Please provide details of the limitations posed by such a small sample and the sampling technique used following the low response rate as part of the methods section (you refer to this when trying to explain the high proportion of Filipinos in the results).

2. Results: does the distribution of the sample in terms of nationality include all countries of highest numbers of nurse migrants?

3. Is nurse recruitment equally taking place in the public and private sector?

4. p11 2nd line … how little they received from Ireland – clarify in terms of what? And from whom? I.e. the government, the employer, social services, community??

5. Make sure you present quotes from all respondents (Clara & Carol seem to get quoted a lot)

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. p8 would be helpful to include age & ethnicity or country of origin of respondents when presenting the quotes
2. p9 1st para – please provide reference
3. p10 replace term ‘lamented’ and last para, take out ‘etc’
4. p11 1st para: repeat of ‘aged over eighteen’ in brackets
5. generally: take out the brackets and include those comments into the full sentence thus improving the flow of the paper. Avoid abbreviations, such as i.e. or e.g
6. p12 1st para, last sentence: elaborate
7. following para: explain naturalisation procedure in footnote
8. p13 1st para ‘secondly’ – there is no mention of ‘firstly’ – rewrite
9. same para sentence starting ‘if they were entitled…’ - this is a recommendation and should not be presented here
10. p13 last para take out or clarify the comments in brackets
11. p14 first sentence: use past tense to present all findings
12. p15 5th para – elaborate
13. p19 last para, sentence ‘However, the reality… ‘ Be careful with drawing such fundamental conclusions from such a small sample! Again take out the brackets
14. p20 last para, GOOD! provide reference
15. p21 last para – this sentence includes generalisations ‘poor countries’ either
define or rewrite. Also next page: who is making these assumptions? Provide references
16. p22 middle para – define intersectoral responses – are we not observing an overlap between personal and work related identities?
17. Headings for the next section is unclear
18. Might be interesting to refer to hierarchies of migration countries which influence migration intention?
19. p23 last para ‘Ireland’s immaturity’ reword
20. same para – the UK NHS has stopped direct international recruitment, so competition is with whom? Define
21. p25 2nd para – this would be better in the introduction
22. p26 1st para ‘weak policy-making capacity’ – by whom?
23. next para repeat of poor/weak data availability
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