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Reviewer's report:

This paper is publishable as presented and I have identified no major compulsory or minor essential revisions. A number of discretionary revisions are identified below.

That said, the paper adds relatively little to work previously published by the lead author. Reference #3 reports on interviews with three nurses, reference #4 on interviews with eight and the present paper on interviews with 18 nurses.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   It is stated that a purposive sample of nurses was used but no further details are given. It would be useful to know how the nurses were selected and if any effort was made to include people working in different situations.

3. Are the data sound?
   The data are sound, given a small qualitative study.

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?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes although there is some repetition and some confusion of tenses, for example, at the end of paragraph 2 under Background, “will be identified” should be “were identified.”

It is unclear to me what “Data is presented in categories, however a limitation of the study is that a fully integrated grounded theory was unable to be produced due to sampling constraints” means. Perhaps this could be explained under discussion.

Results

10. Other suggestions

Background – paragraphs 7 and 8 – the regulation of nurse smear taking is described. This could be clarified and the situation in each State and the Northern Territory described.

The most interesting findings concern the dynamics of GP’s willingness to pass the function of smear taking and women’s health to nurses (specifically – impact of ethnicity of GPs, lack of GP experience and overloading of female GPs) and the quality issues associated with lack of feedback on smear quality to nurses. It would be good if these were included in the abstract. As written, only GP’s, PN’s and patient attitude, and administrative issues are listed – and these seem somewhat trivially self evident.

In summary, this paper is publishable as a small contribution to the field and is of limited interest.
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Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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