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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to comments

Reviewer 1: My only comment is that when you refer to nurses as generalists, most of those working in community specialist services are working as advanced practitioners or that they have been prepared at Masters level to undertake advanced practice roles. You mention that nurse practitioners' are the type of nurse in practice as described in some papers but I think referring in the discussion to 'generalists' is confusing as most of those working in community settings have undertaken masters programmes or some form of advanced practice education.

Response:

We acknowledge the potential confusion, however, we need to highlight that from the review it was evident that many nurses working at a frontline level with clients are registered general nurses with no evidence of education to master’s level. Furthermore, where specialist function at a community level, they do so in some instances supported by generalist nurses. In acknowledging this dilemma, the authors have submitted another paper which is in press relating to the contribution of non-licensed personnel to nursing and midwifery in the community. However, this is beyond the scope of the current paper.

Lines 380-383 has been changed in response to the comment.

Reviewer comment: P. 5- you use the term Western world but it is not relevant as you include Australia- probably more appropriate to use the term High income countries

Response

Changed line 27 on page 5 as recommended.
Reviewer comment: p. 6- the abbreviation DPHNs is used but not explained.
Response Line 120 now includes an explanation as recommended.

Reviewer comment: p.17- you refer in the text to 'end of life’ example referring to the quadrants within the figure 3 diagram as 'curative' but shouldn't this be palliative?

Response page 28 refers to ‘model depicts a person/client on a lifespan and preventative-curative trajectory’ and as such curative is presented as opposite to preventative for purposes of the model.
Changed 387-392 to reflect the above.

Reviewer comment: p. 17- NNU abbreviation used but needs to be in full here.
Response: line 395 changes as recommended

Reviewer comment: Figure 2: very difficult to read so would suggest that this is available as a powerpoint slide for online publication or removed as the font is very small.

Response: We would be delighted if BMC could accommodate this suggestion in including it as a PowerPoint. However, it is integral to the paper.

Reviewer 2: This was a well written and informative paper. The paper was structured in a logical way, that facilitated engagement with the manuscript.

The methods (search strategies) were well explained and transparent.

Findings were logical, and well supported, although I did feel there was a little discrepancy in the length of the sections for each theme (Theme 2 seemed significantly bigger).

Conclusions were logical, well founded and explicit.
Response: we thank you for your comments and we acknowledge that theme 2 is significantly larger as this constituted the core of the evidence extracted from the literature.