I have edited the paper as if it were a historical research paper that has taken a narrative approach, based on what you have intended to achieve here

1. There is perhaps a misunderstanding or some confusion between what the reviewers are asking for (in particular reviewer 2) and what you have understood this to mean.

I think there is also a mismatch between what the reviewers thought you are seeking to write and how you should therefore structure her material (some sort of integrative review of the literature on health policy and nursing, with a particular reference to Israel—although about half of the paper is a review of literature that relates to this research in other countries) and what you set out to write (a paper based on historical methods (primary and secondary sources) that is structured as a narrative approach to discuss developments in nursing in Israel following the 1995 NHI Law and sets these in comparison with developments in other Western countries).

2. I would guess the confusion has arisen because the paper needs structure and a coherent narrative. You do explicitly write that you are using a historical approach and are thus relying on primary sources from archive material, specifically, the archives of the Netanyahu Commission. However, (a) none of these primary sources are cited; (b) most of the paper is a discussion of recent literature related to nursing developments in the U.S. and Europe, with some discussion relating to Israel; (c) you do refer to the NHI Law, but in some parts of the paper this theme gets lost or the paper meanders away from it without it being clear why; and (d) the journal you have chosen has not published very many historical papers with a narrative approach so the reviewers might not be expecting this structure.

3. I think that this is why the reviewers have asked you to produce a methods section and a results section that structure her paper as an integrative literature review with a clear rationale for searches on medical databases for published research on health policy and nursing as it relates to Israel. The results of the searches would then, naturally, form the basis for her integrative literature review—or at least provide a structure for a more “scientific” literature review of extant research on this topic. My guess is they saw an unstructured paper that was mostly some sort of literature review, and suggested a structure based on what is commonly used in the more scientific papers that are published in their journal.

4. However, you are aiming to write a paper based on historical research methods (the use of primary sources, in the main) that presents her arguments via a narrative approach.

5. I had a search, and there not many papers published in the chosen journal that are historical papers with a narrative style (which could be another reason why the reviewers, in trying to find ways to help you structure the paper, have landed on the integrative review method). However, I did find this one:

DeGuzman, Pam & Keeling, Arlene. (2012). Addressing Disparities in Access to Care: Lessons From the Kercheval Street Clinic in the 1960s. Policy, politics & nursing practice. 12. 199-207. 10.1177/1527154411429864.

Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221967103\_Addressing\_Disparities\_in\_Access\_to\_Care\_Lessons\_From\_the\_Kercheval\_Street\_Clinic\_in\_the\_1960s

This paper uses a narrative approach. You can see it has no Methods or Results section of the sort the reviewers suggest, as this is not appropriate for a historical paper. I think this is what you are tr ying to achieve, rather than an integrative review (which, actually, I don’t think would be suitable for what you are attempting.

7. Also, from what you wrote in your draft paper, you seem to understand “review of the literature” as meaning “scanning to see what has been published already and whether that includes papers on her very specific topic.” That is not what the reviewers intended. Again, we come back to the same confusion as described above.

8. Since the journal you have chosen has published a historical paper based on a narrative approach in the past—I think that after the paper has been revised you could point to that paper to explain that you are seeking to use a similar narrative approach as being suitable for your paper that uses traditional historical methods, and that you do not feel that an integrative literature review is suitable for your ***radically* *revised*** paper.

9. You would still need to consider how to present and structure the material in the literature review you have done, so that it supports the main purpose of the paper rather than being a bit of a “grab bag” of various bits of research you have found on nursing. I would also question why you have not actually cited any primary sources. I suggest being very clear on what the purpose of the paper is, and making sure that everything you include in the text supports this purpose. **The paper is intended to focus on the effects of the 1995 NHI Law on Israeli nursing.**

10. I also had a look on JANE (Journal Author Name Estimator) to see what it suggested in terms of journals that D’s paper might be suitable for. This was to help see what other scholars had written on similar-ish topics and how they had structured their work. JANE suggested the Israel Journal of Health Policy Research which has published papers that take a narrative approach to discuss health policy, for example this recent one is somewhat comparable:

**Filc D, Rasooly A, Davidovitch N. From public vs. private to public/private mix in healthcare: lessons from the Israeli and the Spanish cases. Isr J Health Policy Res. 2020 Jun 24;9(1):31. doi: 10.1186/s13584-020-00391-4. PMID: 32580782; PMCID: PMC7315494.**

This paper does not include an integrative literature review of the sort suggested by the reviewer, but uses a narrative approach to discuss the topic of healthcare mixes in Spain and Israel. Again, I think this approach—which is similar to the approach in DeGuzman et al above—is more suited to what you are writing. You could use these two examples in the response to the reviewers when you explain why your radically rethought paper uses a narrative approach (or you could consider if this journal might be another option for her, after she has revised her paper).

11.I have edited the paper as a narrative approach based on the fact that it is a historical paper and the Methods and Results sections you included were (a) not doing what the reviewers intended them to do and (b) she hasn’t written an integrative review and I don’t think you want to; (c) I cannot shape what you have presented into anything approaching an integrative review and even if I could it would not align with the rest of the paper.

To make the paper less of a “grab bag” of facts taken from research papers on nursing around the world, I have tried to order the facts into more of a coherent narrative, so that these facts are grouped together by theme and topic in a way that supports the main argument and purpose of the paper, structured under the four themes. The idea is to improve the organization of the paper so that it has a narrative flow and a structure and does not jump around from topic to topic. I also wanted to make the paper more focused on Israel, such that the research she cites from the U.S./Europe SUPPORTS the arguments on Israel and is not just floating in the text.

12.There are still some things to clear up. One area of confusion for me is that you write that nothing or very little has been published on the impact of the NHI Law on nurses in Israel and then discusses papers that *have* written about this issue—the Spitzer and Golander (2001) paper that you rely on quite heavily, the Rosen et al detailed reports for WHO that discuss the NHI Law and the Netanyahu Commission, and similar studies to the S&G paper (they are not follow up studies as 2 were undertaken before Spitzer & Golander 2001):

“Follow-up studies were later conducted among geriatric, community, and mental health nurses (Levy, 2002; Manor, 2000; Odem, 2002; Re’em, 2002; Teitler, 2000)”.

You do not note at all what any of these papers found. Why? These are your secondary sources for your historical paper.

13.Also, on a style note, I noticed when editing that you have copy-pasted chunks of some of the papers you cite into your text without citing them so that it looks like it is her own writing—I’ve flagged the ones I caught but I could have missed some because I can only search on Google.

14. I have edited the paper to make the sentences read better and more coherently, i.e. made them shorter etc.