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This 3 phased sequential mixed methods study uses a participatory action research design to evaluate nursing and midwifery research activities, culture and capacity in local NSW Australia. Phase 1 reviews literature to build a survey tool, and administer survey. Phase 2 involves focus groups with key stakeholders. Phase 3 involves action learning groups designed to plan, implement and evaluate a research agenda. This is important work to be undertaken, however the details of all of these phases are slim and not sufficiently developed to be well understood. The manuscript could be improved by: 1) identifying why the literature review is needed, if a 31 question survey tool is already developed? 2) Explaining specifically how the Normalization Process Theory is used in any part of the analysis, 3) Explain the process of the confirmatory factor analysis, 4) State hypotheses related to the survey, 5) Identify specific questions that the focus groups are intended to answer; describe who the key stakeholders are, and how they will be recruited, who will lead the focus groups, and who analyzes this data and how the qualitative data are handled and analyzed, 6) discuss what the action groups will do specifically and what will be the outcome of the action research in a much more specific example than the general process briefly mentioned.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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