

Reviewer's report

Title: 'I won't be staying here for long': A Qualitative Study on the Retention of Migrant Nurses in Ireland

Version: 1 **Date:** 25 February 2009

Reviewer: Mireille Kingma

Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) NONE
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) SEE QUESTION 3 AND 5 BELOW. IF THE RESEARCHERS DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE INFORMATION THEN THIS SHOULD BE STATED AS A LIMITATION OF THE STUDY.
- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore) NONE

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? THE QUESTION IS WELL DEFINED AND THE LINK BETWEEN MIGRANT NURSES' INTENTION TO STAY AND FAMILY STABILITY (CITIZENSHIP, RESIDENCY, EDUCATION SUBSIDIES) IS NEW.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? YES
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? THE COLLECTION OF QUALITATIVE DATA IS SOUND. I WOULD HAVE LIKED THE RESEARCHERS TO PROVIDE A FEW MORE DETAILS ON THE RESPONDENTS, E.G. MARITAL STATUS. IT WOULD ALSO HAVE BEEN INTERESTING TO SEE IF THE SAMPLE COHORT SIZE CORRESPONDS TO THE AGE GROUPS IN THE TOTAL NURSE MIGRANT POPULATIONS, E.G. 20% BELOW 30, 40% 31-40 YEARS, ETC. WHILE THE PAPER IMPLIES THAT THE ASSUMPTION THAT MIGRANT NURSES ARE OLDER, THERE IS NO PROOF GIVEN FROM THE REGISTRATION DATA, ONLY FROM THE SAMPLE WHICH MAY BE DISTORTED BY THE METHODOLOGY USED.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? THE PAPER WOULD BE STRONGER IF COHORT COMPARISONS HAD BEEN MADE. THE CONCLUSION ABOUT FAMILY

PRIORITIES MAY NOT BE AS RELEVANT TO UNMARRIED NURSES WHETHER YOUNG OR OLDER. THE CONCLUSIONS MAY THEREFORE BE DISTORTED DEPENDING ON THE AGE COHORT INTERVIEWED. IF IT IS NOT THE CASE, THEN THE AUTHORS SHOULD CLEARLY STATE THIS.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES

7. Is the writing acceptable? YES

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests