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Reviewer's report:

This article offers an important synthesis of the formal pedagogical preparation for nurse scholars. The author describes the dissonance reflected in academic institutions that require proficiency in teaching and research, yet prioritize training in research inquiry and methods. Although the topic offers an important contribution to the literature, the author does not sufficiently describe the methods, efforts to ensure validity and authenticity of the findings, or the type and scope of the results. The author should carefully describe their methodological processes and results to ensure that readers can be confident in their findings.

With the comments addressed below, the manuscript would be suitable for publication.

Background

The background should be structured to reflect an 'assert' and 'justify' approach to paragraph structure. There are a number of sentences with assertions that are not sufficiently justified. For example, the opening paragraph should indicate how health care education is currently structured, its flaws, followed lastly by justifications for restructuring.

* The author should consider how nursing differs (or does not) from other disciplines. How does the pedagogical preparation of nurses compare to other health professions? This would result in either generalizations that are useful to other disciplines, or set nursing apart as unique unto itself.

* Throughout the manuscript the authors assert that academic scholarship is defined in terms of research. This would be bolstered by a careful reflection on traditional reward systems (i.e. tenure) as reflecting the values in the academy. Although outside the scope of the review, it would be important to comment on teaching evaluations/national metrics of teaching excellence and research intensive universities (versus primarily undergraduate teaching institutions).

* Acronyms are inconsistently introduced without description (i.e., AACN, NLN).
* If you are doing to discuss the DNP you should describe what it is in comparison to a traditional PhD and also indicate that it is not prevalent in Canada. This should be clearly stated for international audiences.

* Clarify the purpose statement 'current practices of the academy in relation to a PhD requirement'. Does this mean training in doctoral programs in relation to teaching? This purpose statement is long and not clear. Be more explicit in the focus of the review so it can be related to the search methods.

Methods

* Did you conduct a preliminary search of the literature that indicated there was a variety of methods reflected, and therefore appropriate for an integrative review? How did you come to the decision to use this approach?

* Clarify that the search was not restricted to English language, but reviewed only English language articles (if not, this limited your initial search and was inappropriate)

* What was the process of the review? Were titles and abstracts reviewed first, and then full text?

* Author indicates that each article was evaluated for the purpose characteristics, implications, etc. The articles should have been reviewed for the inclusion criteria. What the authors are describing above is a mix between inclusion criteria and data extraction.

* How many articles were reviewed and subsequently included? How many were not included? Were reference lists of retrieved articles reviewed?

* Although not a systematic review, the authors need to have more explanation of their methods so that they could be replicated (at least in part) by others. There is not enough information about their methods to be confident in the results.

* How was article quality assessed? If not assessed, justify.

Results and Discussion

* Break up the results and discussion. The results should include a short description of the findings (number of studies, study designs, country of origin).
* The authors indicate that questions were identified and framed for this review. This is the first time these questions were described and it is not clear how it related to their purpose statement or their search strategy.

* Overall, the results and discussion would be more clearly described if there was a matrix with the themes (either identified apriori or posthoc after synthesis) and the articles they were from.

* The discussion is long and repetitive. This section would benefit from a flow chart or diagram linking the findings together and describing gaps in the current literature.

* The findings do not seem novel to nursing. This could be a reflection of the limited concrete connections the author makes to the discipline. The author should consider linking their findings to areas unique to the nursing discipline. Example, the focus on undergraduate preparation (versus graduate preparation) is unique to nursing due to the societal imperative to graduate a certain number of licensed nurses every year in order to staff the health system.

**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.

Yes

**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:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

None

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal