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Overall

The paper addresses an interesting topic - the disconnect between expected and actual roles.

The mixed methods approach is methodologically interesting, but the relationship between the types of data accessed by the two methods is not considered, and I feel there are epistemological issues which undermine the equivalence afforded the interview and observation data.

There are other issues in the clarity of the methods and the presentation of results which make the value of this paper hard to judge.

Intro

Nice summary of topic, although perhaps a little brief. A bit more articulation of what the literature says the roles of doctors and nurses are both perceived to be (as per the literature), and regulated to be (in terms of limits on practice in particular), but would be helpful for establishing the context. There is a historical literature on doctor-nurse relationships that would seem relevant here.

Methods

The methodological approach is interesting, but I have concerns about its validity. The presence of codes is interview transcripts was compared with the occurrence of behaviour similarly coded in recordings of simulated interactions. This seems to have two risks, which I don't think are adequately addressed in the description of methods: firstly, that interviews will consistently access role descriptors between participants, and secondly that simulation scenarios will consistently elicit the full range of behaviours. More detail of both methods would be necessary to judge this risk, but I feel that there may be a fundamental problem here - there is an
epistemological difference between responses constructed during interviews, and those exhibited in practice.

The approach to analysis is not clear - a stepwise setting out of the different stages would make the relationship between quant and qual elements of analysis clearer.

Results

The presentation of the results is quite brief, and could be more analytical in considering how and why lack of concordance is observed.

The quantitative analysis needs explaining for the reader - why was kappa used and what does it demonstrate?

It isn't clear how the tabulated concordance is derived - does 'absent' mean that none of the participants exhibited the behaviour in the simulation?

Discussion

Putting aside concerns about the premise of the results, the discussion is well written, and situates the findings in the literature. However it does feel a little descriptive, rather than interpretative, and lacks synthesis.

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.

No
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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