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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I read your manuscript "Nursing and midwifery research activity in Arab countries (1950 - 2017)", with great interest. The manuscripts has some very good points, however, there are some areas that need to be strengthened. Please find my suggestions below:

Abstract:
Line 35: Methodology: Expand this part and include more information to it.

Introduction:
Line 67-70: This parts needs rephrasing to be more comprehensible.
Line 70-72: Instead of reference # 9 and 10, authors should include:
Line 74-76: In this paragraph, add some historical aspect of the nursing and midwifery research.
Line 88-93: Seems like the authors are stretching it, this part needs to be reduced.

Methods (indicators should be mentioned as paragraphs rather than using the bullet points)
Line 97: Give details of the database (Scopus) used.
Line 101: One of the major problems with Scopus is that its records only go back to 1966 (see Azer et al below). How was this issue addressed in the current paper?
Line 103-106: Authors should either mention the names of the 22 countries or include a reference to this point.
Line 106-108: Why did not the authors use this classification? Please add a relevant reference.
Line 109: "The field of nursing was defined as……" is it a typo? Please rewrite this clearly.
Line 113: "nursing-related keyword in the title and at least one of…” should be revised as "nursing-related keyword in the title, with at least one of…."
Line 114: "include nursing, nurse, midwife, midwives,….." Please enclose these words in an inverted comma
Line 115: What was the starting month? When was the search performed? Was it done on a single day or many?
Line 118: Authors have cited all the papers published by them; they should cite the work of others too.
Line 123: Is "X.Y." a typo? Should it be "X, Y"?
Line 125: "Interclass correlation coefficient" or "Intraclass"?
Line 126: The cited papers did not clearly report details of the ICC that the authors used, please specify.
Line 127: The ICC is represented like 95% or 0.95? Please correct this.
Line 129: Discuss whether inter-rater reliability was measured or not? If no, why?
Line 135: If there was a formula used for any of the indicators, authors should explicitly mention it here.
Line 151: What about the size of the circle? Authors should add details about it.
Line 157: Why did not authors use the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) for ranking journals?

Results:
Line 164: This should be reported as a Table instead or should be merged with the previous sub-section i.e. Research output.
Line 167: conference papers were full-length papers or abstracts? Please explain the 'unknown type' and why did it happen?
Line 168-170: Probably there is an error in the calculation. The total number of papers as it appears here is 2969 and the percentage is 101.1%?
Line 177: Authors should mention the color of fifth cluster.
Line 180: 20107 should be changed to 20,107.
Line 209: Expand this section as the line for UK, Australia and other Arab countries is also important. Also, mention the link strength values here.
Line 219: Did authors of the current manuscript exclude self-citations while ranking authors? If not, it should be explicitly reported. How was the issue of multiple author affiliations dealt with, if it occurred.
Line 231: Mention the name of the university in italics.

Discussion:
Line 236: Instead of writing this, authors should use a broad statement about the findings of the current study.
Line 252: Relatively low as compared to what?
Line 263-265: How? Please expand this part and substantiate it with appropriate reference(s).
Line 265-266: Why? Please expand this part and substantiate it with appropriate reference(s).
Line 266-267: Why? Please expand this part and substantiate it with appropriate reference(s).
Line 269-271: This sentence does not make sense here. Authors are suggested to explain and strengthen this complete paragraph.
Line 274: the term "neglected" should be enclosed into inverted comma
Line 278-281: This part should be re-written clearly.
Line 281: 1900 should be 1900s and "in Jordan is considered…” should be changed to "in Jordan, it is considered…"
Line 282-284: Did this conflict have any negative effects overall such as brain drain etc.?
Line 294: Strengths and limitations of the study should be written in a separate paragraph. Authors should also consider mentioning other limitations discussed earlier in my comments.

Conclusion:
Line 298: "countries is in the rise and..." should be changed to "countries is on rise and..."
Line 306: "topic" should be corrected to "topics" and "their role" should be explicitly written as to whose role?

Journal's requirements:
Line 312: Other abbreviations used in the manuscript should also be mentioned.
Line 317: Authors should mention these details in the methods section of the manuscript as well.
Line 325: One of the authors of the current manuscript is one of the top authors in nursing (according to the findings of this study). This should be disclosed and authors should disclose his/her influence on the study findings.

Please see this paper for more details:

References:
Name of the journal in all references (where applicable) should be abbreviated according to the journal's (BMC HSR) guidelines.

Tables
Table 5: Authors should mention details about the SMJ in the text of the manuscript, as this journal, apart from the Jordan Medical Journal, is one of the top journals publishing papers from nursing sciences.
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