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Reviewer's report:

A well written paper that covers a significant amount of literature. The argument for examining the topic is well laid out.

Data collection and extraction matrix appropriate for the paper and categories and themes identified described in adequate detail.

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.

Comments refer to some minor points:

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

p. 6- the abbreviation DPHNs is used but not explained.

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?

p. 17- NNU abbreviation used but needs to be in full here.

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.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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