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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read MS# FAMP-D-19-00344R1 entitled "Complexity as a Factor for Task Allocation among General Practitioners and Nurse Practitioners: A Systematic Review." The review addresses an important issue in primary healthcare. However, I have some concerns regarding the methodological quality:

1. Line 96: in terms of publishing range (July 1st 2006 to November 28th 2017), please provide justification for why articles published before 2006 were not considered. Also the searches should be updated to check for any articles published within the past two years (November 29th 2017 to present).
2. Line 109: from my understanding, only PubMed was searched, so relevant articles could have been missed. In order to increase confidence in the results, the searches should be re-run on at least one other database (e.g., CINAHL).

In general, I think the manuscript would benefit from being checked for grammatical and typographical errors. Also, when complexity is first introduced in the background section, the authors mention the Cynefin Framework (line 77) and Kernick's continuum (line 78), however, these frameworks are not defined in detail until the discussion section (lines 275-276; lines 264-265). I think it would make sense to move these definitions to the background where these frameworks are first listed as this should help to improve the reader's understanding.

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.

Unable to assess

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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