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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your letter containing some additional concerns in regards to our manuscript, NURS-D-17-002125, that we will try our best to address below for you. Below follows an account of the responses made and changes done to the manuscript. We have coloured all changes done. We hope that our replies will be satisfying and we are looking forward to hear from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Katarina Sjögren Forss
Reviewer reports:

Konstantinos Antypas (Reviewer 2): The authors have satisfactorily responded to most of my comments, but I believe that there are still a few issues that could improve this paper. My suggestions aim in improving the quality of the reporting of this study.

In Introduction the authors mention the existence of ANPs educated in Linköping and Skövde. It seems that some of them work in primary care. Were any of them interviewed?

Response: No, none of the nurses interviewed had an education as ANP.

And even more important, did any of the interview subjects have collaboration or contact with the ANPs.

Response: None of the participants had a collaboration or contact with the ANPs.

Are any of the ANPs employed in the areas where the interview subjects are working? If yes, it would be very interesting to mention that and also present any differences between the subjects that have been "exposed" to the ANP role and those that have not.

Response: No, none of the ANPs are employed in the areas where the participants of this study is working.

-- Thank you for providing this information to us, but I am expecting that this information is useful for your audience too. Please include it in the manuscript.

Response: On page 5, we have added: “None of the nurses had an education as ANP and none of the participants had a collaboration or contact with ANPs. There is no ANP employed in the area where the participants of this study are working”.

The publication of the English translation of the interview guide can also be interesting for better understanding the results of the study.

Response: On page 5, "Data collection" we describe the questions used. Therefore, we did not add the interview guide as we do not think it would bring more information to the readers.
-- I still find the description of the questions used under "Data collection" incomplete. More specifically, the combination of the introductory question (that is not reported as it was posed) with the follow-up questions seems incomprehensible, and not as precise as a scientific report should be. The how, what and why are certainly important when planning an interview study (Kvale&Brinkman, 2009, Interviews p. 105), but they way they are reported in this paper, do not offer an understanding of how they guided the semi-structured interviews. In addition, the publication of the interview guide is part of the COREQ checklist (https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966/Consolidated-criteria-for-reporting-qualitative).

Response: We have added the interview guide as an appendix (appendix 1).

-- In addition to my previous comment, the authors should use the COREQ checklist to make sure that they are reporting properly all the aspects of this study. If the COREQ checklist is used, it should also be explicitly mentioned in the manuscript.

Response: As requested by the reviewer, we have used the COREQ checklist (appendix 2). On page 6 we have added: “The qualitative methods and reporting of results adhere to the COREQ (Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies) [35] guidelines (appendix 2)”. 