Response to “Authors’ response to reviews” – Major compulsory revisions

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The added revisions adequately address the criticism raised in my previous review.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Nothing to address

3. Are the data sound?
The added revisions partially address the criticism raised in my previous review. I find the use of the term ‘purposive’ sampling a little perplexing here – it suggests a targeted approach to identify relevant participants (based on the characteristics mentioned in the text – such as age, experience, and geographic location). If such a targeted approach was used, it would imply that some potential participants were not interviewed, presumably because interviews had already been conducted on that ‘type’ of participant. If that is the case, the number of non-interviews should also be documented in the paper. If not, then it would seem to have the hallmarks of a convenience sample. Additionally, the use of snowballing seems a little unusual given that it would be most commonly used to recruit ‘hard to reach’ groups, which is not a descriptor I would apply to PNs and HVs. It does tend to suggest difficulty in recruiting participants, which would be indicative of another limitation to the study, which could be addressed in the paper.

It would be helpful in the text to clarify that 9 interviews were conducted on HVs, and 9 on PNs. It would also be helpful to clarify who undertook the interviews (page 7, line 3).

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Nothing to address

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The added revisions partially address the criticism raised in my previous review. The points raised in the response – that length of service would give readers some indication of level of experience and the type of training they would have
received – are (a) not really addressed in the revised text of the paper (eg full time /part time breakdown has not been added), and (b) open to conjecture particularly because of the lack of hard relationships between length of service and training.

Additionally, there is no explanation in the text why participant’s children are included (and ages), and it would be helpful to better explain the three criteria in the final column (eg affluence [affluent / mixed / deprived], rurality [city / rural], and cultural diversity [ethnic / alternative] and how these data were derived (especially the last).

On page 9, line 3 refers to: “Across the interviews participants spoke of a change in their relationship with patients, and of patients becoming more involved in assessing evidence themselves and less accepting of ‘blanket’ (HV 05), ‘one fits all’(PN02) health advice.” It should be made clearer in this sentence that this is a temporal change across all patients, rather than changes within individual patients as their disease progresses and they become more knowledgeable. This point is clearly made in the following sentences but should be clarified here.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The added revisions adequately address the criticism raised in my previous review. [Although see my comment 3 above about another potential limitation].

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Nothing to address

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The added revisions adequately address the criticism raised in my previous review.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes – though there are a large number of cases in which apostrophes are missing or superfluous: see p.5 line 5 should be “parents’ anxieties”; page 9 line 17 should be “participants spoke”, page 11, line 2 should be “health visitors’ and practice nurses”; page 13 line 3 should be “participants’ accounts”; page 17 line 2 should be “colleagues’ practical knowledge”

Other points to consider:
• Page 6, second para. The text commencing “We found that…” is more suited to the results section. The text commencing “One obvious drawback…” is more suited to the discussion / limitations section.