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Reviewer's report:

Suggest - This reviewer does not agree with sentence 36 "Brightman (8) best articulated the issue of the lack of formal teaching preparation in higher education" It has been said that college teaching is the only profession for which there is no professional training, and it is commonly argues that this is because our graduate schools train scholars and scientists rather than teachers. We are more concerned with the discovery of knowledge than with its dissemination." (p; 1).

1) This was written by Skinner (n.d.) (p. 77). Please correct this.

2) Were all the 140 references cited in the article? If not, suggest to delete the reference.

3) Would the author complete a cross reference for all references cited in the manuscript?

4) This topic was of interest to this reviewer. Having recently completed the DNP degree wanted to verify if the PhD or DNP degree prepared a nurse educator. It seems that neither the PhD or DNP degree adequately prepares an academic nurse educator.

5) I found the article very interesting and relevant to current practice today. This is a well written article. Thank you for the opportunity to peer review this manuscript.

This is an integrative literature review. Title of manuscript: To what extent has doctoral (PhD) education supported academic nurse educators in their teaching roles: An integrative review. This study was conducted in Canada.

1) The purpose of the integrative literature review: is to explore the state of the literature regarding the current practices of the academy in relation to a PhD requirement, acknowledgement of the value of teaching, and the recognition of teaching as scholarship.
2) Did the author identify what is known and not known about the practice question and how the literature review will address any gaps in knowledge?

3) Were the supporting references the most current available? A total of 140 references, out of 140, only 43 were in the recommended 5 year time frame.

4) Were the supporting references relevant to the subject being reviewed? Yes, the supporting references were relevant to the subject being reviewed.

5) Were the conclusions of the author(s) unbiased and consistent with the literature reviewed? Yes, the conclusions by the author included several key themes. 1) Theme 1 - expectations of academic nurse educators - are required to deliver quality education to nursing students, yet do not have any formal preparation. A doctoral degree is preferred and a requirement for a position as an academic nurse educator. A PhD is a research-focused degree with no formal teaching. 2) Theme 2 - lack of agreement on what constitutes scholarship from standards for teaching, scholarly teaching, and the teacher-scholar vary. 3) Theme 3 - Research related productivity 4) Theme 4 - teaching is secondary. 5) Theme 5 - lack of agreement regarding educational preparation. 6) Theme 6 - suggestion for graduate programs to offer streams in education, research, or clinical practice that are designed to meet specific roles and responsibilities. 7) Theme 7 - different educational pathways offered in the US and Canada differ.

6) Were the findings of the literature review accurately summarized in tables or figures? No, the findings were not summarized in tables or figures.

7) Were recommendations made for future practice or study?

Yes, as there were recommendations for future discussions to consider national nursing licensing bodies versus the desired future of nursing education based on realistic expectations. There should be a consistent approach to the preparation of academic nurse educators. The PhD program is the only program offered in Canada. In the US, the PhD, DNP, and EdD is offered in the US. Makes this difficult to generalize to the US.
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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