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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for this interesting manuscript which addressed an important topic. I have a few minor comments which I hope they find useful.

1.) The authors do not state why they chose to exclude studies before July 2006 or the reason they only included studies that were in English and German language. It may also be worth mentioning this in the limitations as excluding/not accounting for countries in other languages may have led to studies being missed by the search strategy.

2.) The author states that they read 823 full texts which I find a bit overwhelming to conduct independently. This is not a suggestion but rather an observation. Is this possibly a typo or were there any additional steps that narrowed down the number of full-text studies?

3.) The implications would benefit from a more in-depth discussion about some of the potential methods that could enhance the allocation of complex care. Currently the only implication to further clarify the allocation of complex care is enhancing mutual role understanding. However, there are other factors which can enhance skill-mix in primary care settings that are not addressed/covered in this section.

4.) Are there any recommendations for future research as a result of this systematic review?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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