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Reviewer's report:

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.
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).

-- 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.

**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.

Yes

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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