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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript further. The authors have addressed the points raised in the previous review and the points I raise are minor essential revisions and largely minor editorial points.

I am still a little unclear on the proposed sample size and have some concerns that the data analysis methods proposed are not suited to one dataset. The authors may consider this further as the study evolves.

Abstract

Line three introduces the term CNC for the first time. If the authors specifically wish to use the term CNC here write in full with abbreviation. It might be clearer if the preceding sentence and this sentence used Nurse Consultant or CNC rather than the two different terms that are used. Similarly line 9 uses the term consultant, while line 10 uses Nurse Consultant. As the title uses Nurse Consultant, I wonder whether this should not be used in the Abstract, or the title amended to Clinical Nurse Consultant.

This same issue continues with the paragraph on design where to different terms are used.

Line 19 uses LHD and NSW, which will not be clear to the readers in their abbreviated form.

Discussion moves between the use of CNC and Nurse Consultant.

Background

Page 4,

line 71 – no capitals on nurse consultant, capital on International

Line 77 non NP – no previous introduction of NP abbreviation

Line 82, add for example, before NSW, as this is not the only descriptor of CNC in Au

Page 16

I am still a little unclear on the intended sample size given the planned modelling. There appear to be 43 items in the survey, are the authors suggesting below that they will aim for 10 x the number of items as the minimum sample, or 10 x the number of constructs (which are not clearly identified in the description of the survey).
“Based on the predicted return rate and hypothesised model, we utilise the rule-of-thumb for PLS SEM sample sizes of at least equivalent to the larger of; a) ten times the number of the construct with the largest number of formative indicators in the outer model”

The planned analysis still looks a little ambitious, particularly from the one set of data. This possibly needs some further consideration as the study evolves.
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