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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript. The authors are to be congratulated on this informative and well presented research. I have only a few comments for consideration.

I note that the authors include both nurse practitioners and general practice nurses in this research, yet cite papers with nurse practitioners (eg Schadewaldt V, McInnes E, Hiller JE, Gardner). General practice nurses who are not nurse practitioners comprise the largest group of nurses working in general practice. Recent research reports the role of this group of nurses in terms of teamwork and collaboration with general practitioners (see McInnes, S. Peters, K. Bonney, A and Halcomb, E). Publications in this area do show that this group of nurses make a valuable contribution to collaboration in general practice and could have been included in the background.

Methods: There is no discussion on whether the survey was designed by the authors or a verified survey was used. If it was the authors, what prior experience did they have in survey design?

Results

Line 246-247 - confusing sentence. Suggest rephrase

Line 261 - result of nurses justifies inclusion of papers relating specifically to collaboration with general practice nurses who are not nurse practitioners

Discussion

Line 285 - missing word "of" currently reads "not part a PCN"
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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