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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Page 2 - The clarity of the methods section of the abstract could be improved by logically sequencing what was done.

Page 2 - It appears that these three concepts came from the literature and not the data. How did the researchers ensure that they did not "fit" the data into the literature rather than analyze what emerged?

Page 4 - For the international audience it would be good to see some discussion about the role of NPs in primary care in other countries and/or implementation issues.

Page 4 - This description of what was done belongs in the methods not the background section.

Page 4 - These sections on barriers and facilitators need to link more closely with the surrounding text.

Page 5 - Was this analysis part of the study? Or conducted as a background literature review? Given its strong influence on the research questions some explanation of how the review was conducted would inform the reader.

Page 5 - Were any strategies used to explore other factors that may have emerged from the data?

Page 7 - It is unclear if it is being suggested that transcripts were returned to participants or if some other kind of summary was provided to the participant. If it was some other kind of summary it is unclear how this was collected and used in the data analysis.

Page 9 - This is more like a historical discussion - it is unclear how it stems from the data collection.

Page 9 - It is difficult to appreciate these direct quotes without knowing who they came from. Whilst it is important to ensure confidentiality the professional designation of the participant would help the reader to interpret the comments.

Page 11 - Given that only 3 NPs are the focus of this study it is difficult to
determine how much of their experience is related to these three individual clinicians and their personal attributes.

Page 14 - It is interesting that data on community involvement is reported but only 1 consumer was included in this study. Perhaps involving more consumers may have changed the data presented here.

Page 17 - How did the researchers determine that NPs were incorporating these competences in their practice?

Page 17 - Given that these concepts came out of the literature review, it is difficult to see how the study data added to the model.

Page 18 - It is unclear how the community member listed in Table 1 fits with this text.

Page 19 - This paragraph does not fit well with the rest of the text.

Page 26 - From the methods I had envisaged that multiple documents were reviewed. Was there any evaluation documents that could have been looked at? Or any records of NP services that could have informed the study?

Page 26 - Not sure that this table adds anything to the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

Page 3 - This paragraph may be better ordered in chronological order of events.

Page 4 - This sentence is repeated in the methods section.

Page 6 - It is unclear from this sentence what kinds of documents are being referred to.

Page 7 - It would be good to understand why documents were not coded alongside transcripts and what strategies were used to analyze these data.

Page 8 - These introductory statements are repetitive and not necessary here.

Page 8 - The results section needs to contain only data that has emerged from the study.

Page 11 - How was it determined that they spent this amount of time on patient care?

Discretionary Revisions

Page 2 - Would be good to include primary care as a key word

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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