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Reviewer's report:

General
I think this is an excellent paper and the authors' responses to previous reviewers' comments have greatly strengthened it. The paper presents a systematic review of the literature and there is now a much clearer audit trail (eg, by inclusion of a table of excluded studies). There is also now just the right level of discussion about previous research and relevant theory. The paper is well written, coherent, and provides signposts for the research community.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
There is a typo in the 2nd paragraph, 2nd line, of page 14 (should read "who did not DESCRIBE THE frequency...).”

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
The authors may wish to reconsider the statement (page 6) that "nursing practice does not typically include medical diagnosis or prescribing of diagnostic or therapeutic interventions...". Certainly in the UK that is not the case (nor has it been for some time), particularly at nurse specialist level and in primary care. There are large domains of nursing care (wound care being an example) where they have done all that for years and others where developments are more recent but tangible. The (relatively) recent legislation in the UK to permit nurses with a small amount of extra training to prescribe almost any drug really only legalises practices that have gone on for years (where nurse writes prescription and doctor signs it).

I still feel that whilst you outline three reasons why measurement of research use rather than provider behaviour change is what matters, you do not really justify why self report of research use is valid.

I think (but do not expect you to address) the rejection of studies of nurse practitioners "because... their practice is more closely aligned to medicine than nursing)" is a weakness.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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