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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting topic and one that I can see that the authors have given considerable time exploring. However, at the moment, the structure and language of this manuscript made it difficult to read at times.

Line 5 - Background appears more like an aim
Line 7 - "Data collection was mostly based on.." if mostly, what else was used?
Line 32 - "Everything suggests" appears to be a very broad statement
Line 34-36 - First of several one sentence paragraphs
Line 42 - It would be good to know why this is important to understand
Line 42 - "professional logics" need to clarify.
Line 49-50 - Given these references it would be good to clarify this this is related to nurse practitioners
Line 51 - "a wider basket" is used several times throughout this manuscript and lacks academic language
Line 54 - Says who? Needs a reference
Line 58-59 - "our analysis" belongs in the results not in the background.
Line 79 - "….are not appropriate for analyzing complex interventions" needs a reference.
Line 85 - missing "a". Should read "from a realist review"
Line 116-120 - Needs to be supported by a reference

Pg 6 Footnote - I note that the term "general practice" is not listed within the search terms. As this is a common term in the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia, I wonder if the authors would have generated additional information by including this term?

Search strategy - A prisma diagram would have been beneficial here
Line 195 - Need to add (Figure 1)
Line 198 - "…is probably the dominant model…" in which papers?
Line 199 - "more or less" is not appropriate academic language
Line 219 - Nurse led clinics also operate in Australia and may have been identified if the term general practice had been used in the authors search
Line 220 - Missing "." Between reference and "We"
Line 246 - "etc" is used several times and should be avoided
Line 249 & 257 - "PHNCP" is used. I presume the authors mean PHCNP?
Line 281 - A quote is used which is not supported by a reference
Line 297 - There is no Figure 4 provided.
Line 300 - 303 - The authors state "we define.. " but provide a reference by Nelson et al. (2014).
Line 353 - "In the diagram.." which one?
Line 363 - "we'll get back to this in the conclusion" is not appropriate in an academic journal article.
Line 393 - I would suggest the authors choose a term and stick with it. At the moment the authors switch between literature survey and literature review.
Line 426 - "even though we have not touched upon the topic here" The authors should avoid drawing conclusions on topics that have not been presented.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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