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Author's response to reviews:

We would like to thank both reviewers for their helpful comments

Reviewer: John Petkov

1. The use of Factor Analysis to reduce the dimensions of the questionnaire is helpful. I would remove reference to eigenvalues being greater than 1 as a measure of how many factors to retain. This is the Kaiser Criterion and is now regarded as obsolete.

We have deleted this.

2. I urge the authors to look at Random Coefficient Regression when next they look at repeated measures analyses. One of the drawbacks of RMAnova is the curse of almost all such analyses-subjects drop out and power is lost. From 129 subjects only 51 remained at 12 months. Using random effects models all information is used and each subject gets a predicted score. As long as the data is missing at random (MAR) at worst then the model is valid. The best practitioners of longitudinal data analysis such as Hedeker, Davidian etc recommend that RMAnova not be used. random effects modelling is easily implemented in SPSS under Mixed Models. I am not asking that the authors redo these analyses-only that they make themselves aware of the modern methods.

Thank you for the above comments and we fully agree with it. We used repeated measures ANOVA because it gives the mean score and 95% CI at multiple time points for each group. Also it gives main effect of group and time at each occasion with their interactions and polynomial effects of time.

3. Please do not use "NS" for non-significance. Give the actual p-score.
We have changed these

4. When using a paired t-test one expects the mean difference and its confidence interval to be reported. All we get here is the p-score and the group means and these do not reflect the mean difference at all. Also effect sizes and their confidence intervals need to be reported. Confidence intervals and effect sizes tell much more than a mere p-score.

We have corrected these analyses.

Reviewer: Elizabeth Halcomb

5. To enhance the international transferability of the paper, some more detail around the nature of Australian community nursing and how it differs from other health systems may be helpful.

We have added some more detail in the introduction.

6. Pg 12 - it is unclear what is meant by n=X in the paragraph under the heading focus groups.

This has been removed

7. The separation of data under headings of quantitative and qualitative in the results section is somewhat distracting to the reader. Integration of data might enhance the readability and flow of these sections.

We have restructured the results