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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this important piece of work.

The paper is well-written and the methods demonstrated rigour for the approach utilised.

My only comment is with discussion section. It was very clear in the data that CWs experienced role ambiguity with what they do in LTCs and comparing with what they can do in private hospitals or other facilities. This is indeed a huge challenge to the nursing profession and the workforce within the aged care sector. I suggest you include in the discussion how does this ambiguity and role confusion potentially contribute to client outcomes and the public perceiving ‘who is the nurse?’ or ‘who does what?’ and does this have some legal implication from a South African context where non-regulated personnel practices registered nurses’ scope?

Please add new literature on work roles in LTC. Our literature review published in 2017 examined key studies that have explored nursing work and roles of registered nurses in LTC. The literature review presented a contemporary and important findings relevant to your work.

Here is the reference:
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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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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