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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you for your recent correspondence. We would like to thank the Reviewers for their time in reviewing our manuscript. We have provided responses to each Reviewers comments in the table below. Please note, this manuscript was originally submitted with a cover letter that outlined the purpose of the paper as a "Debate article" for consideration. This seems to have not been recognised by the Reviewers and thus much of the feedback provided is based on the assumption that the manuscript was a research article or literature review. Please find attached the cover letter that was submitted with the original manuscript for your reference.

In addition to the response to Reviewers, we have reviewed and edited the manuscript for comprehension and grammar using tracked changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referee 1 Feedback</th>
<th>Response from authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The paper is an informative literature review? Or brief communication? Or other format? There is not any structure for this manuscript. I think, its current structure means it is not suitable for publication. | • This paper was submitted as a “Debate” article and the existing structure and format conforms to BMC Nursing Guidelines for Debate articles – which has been retrieved for your reference from the web site:

  “Manuscripts for Debates submitted to BMC Nursing should be divided into the following sections (in this order): Title page, Abstract, Keywords, Background, Discussion, Summary, List of abbreviations used (if any), Competing interests, Authors’ contributions, Authors’ information, Acknowledgements, Endnotes, References, Illustrations and figures (if any), Tables and captions (if any)” [http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcnurs/authors/instructions/debate; retrieved 25.09.14]. |
| 2. I would suggest authors make a stronger connection between nurse workforce, shortage and new graduates, but more importantly restructure the paper using the usual conventions for a literature review as follows: | • Due to a lack of data systems currently in Australia that monitor primary health care nursing workforce statistics and new graduate nurse workforce statistics - it is not possible to make a 'stronger connection between the nurse workforce shortage and new graduates", other than what has been outlined in the current manuscript;  
  • The main focus of the manuscript is discussing the merits of a New Graduate Transition Program to Primary Health Care as a potential primary health care nursing workforce development and sustainability strategy. |
| • Introduction: what is currently known about the shortage and statistics, number of nurses, and equitation between these amounts. In Australia, what is not known and what is the gap in knowledge that you are trying to fill? The section titled 'background' should also be included in this introduction section | • The manuscript conforms to the Guidelines for formatting Debate Articles in BMC Nursing;  
  • Information regarding what is currently known about primary health care nursing workforce shortages is presented in the Discussion section [Lines 142 – 146].  
  • The debate article is not trying to fill a gap in knowledge but discuss the merits of a New Graduate Transition Program to Primary Health Care as a potential primary health care nursing workforce development and sustainability strategy. |
| • Methods: this section should                                                                                                           | • Please refer to previous comments concerning the manuscript                                                                                                           |
detail your search strategy and databases. Currently your search terms of "nurse workforce, Australian nurse workforce, primary health care seem inadequate however the databases are appropriate. You may need to explain databases.

- **Results:** here you should detail the number of papers identified from your methods, how many were included / excluded in your review and why (what were your inclusion / exclusion criteria)? Currently your paper does not have this detail.
- **Discussion:** it is in this section that you should detail your results by themes such as factors related to nurse workforce/new graduate in Australia; you should categorize your innovation or suggestion on the headline or on the table.
- **Conclusion:** you should write a strong conclusion that derived from finding and discussion. However, consider whether there are additional points regarding the implications of your findings for primary health care / nurse workforce , education, research and policy.

### Referee 2 Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Ageing the population and the same time ageing the nursing workforce is one of the big universal nursing issues, especially in the future, your program for shifting the new graduate nurses from general practice to PHC can prevent some of the problems.</th>
<th>• We acknowledge and thank the reviewer for these comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. As you know an academic article has a specific structure, thus you can get in the author guide section of a journal. The abstract section has no good structure, it includes background, discussion and so summery! The reader cannot understand your method and result.</td>
<td>• This paper was submitted as a “Debate” article and the existing structure and format conforms to BMC Nursing Guidelines for Debate articles. The Abstract conforms to these Guidelines and does not require a Methods or Result section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think that your manuscript is include of good data regarding the Australian nursing</td>
<td>• Please refer to previous comments concerning the manuscript submission as a “Debate article” not a literature review or research article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workforce, the new program to modify the nursing workforce in the future and so on, but should be transformed in the academic article form.

4. It doesn't look like as the article, its' like a report or research proposal, too wordy and need to be revised, it has not any tables, figures and so there are so many abbreviations in the last paragraph. I asked your research team to change this very good data to form of an article and send again to BMC Journal please.

- Please refer to previous comments concerning the manuscript submission as a “Debate article” not a literature review or research article;
- A table [Table 1: Page 23] is presented and outlines proposed governing principles associated with the design, implementation and evaluation of a Graduate Nurse Transition Program to Primary Health Care
- Abbreviations have been minimised throughout the manuscript and where included, are considered necessary. A list of Abbreviations has been included in the Manuscript [pages 17 & 18] per BMC Nursing submission Guidelines for Debate articles.

**Editorial Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Response from Authors</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Acknowledgements</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include the source(s) of funding for each author, and for the manuscript preparation. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. If a language editor has made significant revision of the manuscript, we recommend that you acknowledge the editor by name, where possible.

The role of a scientific (medical) writer must be included in the acknowledgements section, including their source(s) of funding. We suggest wording such as 'We thank Jane Doe who provided medical writing services on behalf of XYZ Pharmaceuticals Ltd.'

Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section.

- An acknowledgement section was not included in the original manuscript because this is a Debate Article and only the Authors contributed to the development of the manuscript. No other parties require acknowledgement. The contributions of each author are included in the section “Authors Contributions” on page 18;
- The development of the Debate article was not associated with funding or a funded project.
2. Requesting Ethics statement

Research involving human subjects (including human material or human data) that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. Research carried out on humans must be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration ([http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html](http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html)). A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate.

- Please refer to previous comments concerning the manuscript submission as a “Debate article” not a literature review or research article.