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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is a comprehensive study of nursing research in Arab nations. The authors appear to have performed a thorough study. I only have a few questions (1) I am slightly dubious about why the authors publish the names of the most prolific researchers; this seems likely to lead to some controversy, and it does make me wonder about potential political implications of this study; (2) In the Discussion, one reason that is offered for the upswing in the number of papers is increased international collaboration, but this is not per se a reason for increase and doesn't answer the question as to WHY there would be more international collaboration that would increase research collaborations.

I think the conclusions in both the Abstract and the overall paper are a little skewed. The conclusion in the Abstract states that research in Arab nations is in its infancy, which is hard to assess without a comparator. Indeed in several places, the authors say things like "relatively...", but relative to what? Which countries are they comparing to? The overall Conclusion needs some work. In contrast to the rest of the paper, the English is weak, and it reads more like a list of recommendations than a conclusion based on what went before. I would also like to see some references/examples of, specifically, the authors' claim that nursing research improves practice. This is stated as a given, but in theory at least, the nursing profession could follow evidence-based guidelines and still provide good care without actually performing the research themselves.

In general, the paper is well written, except for the Conclusion.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I believe the issues are minor and the authors could mostly just soften the conclusion and be a little less generous with the recommendations.
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