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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: Required changes have been made and are acceptable.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for considering the comments made to the initial submission and responding to them so well. This paper is much improved, with greater conceptual clarity and a coherent focus.

The biggest issue that remains for me is accuracy. Two articles I am really familiar with are not yet described accurately. This raises the question about whether the other studies are also depicted inaccurately. This issue of accuracy needs to be addressed throughout all of the articles. The two specific articles that I am aware of are the following:

The statement about the MacLeod et al. study has been changed but there are some new issues with it. It would be accurate if the statement were to read, "A 2017 article from Canada [36] provides evidence that 15.8% of all RURAL nurses are in casual jobs, and that casualization is particularly common among REGISTERED NURSES AND Licensed Practical Nurses (16.5%), and more common among those nurses living [[delete: outside of the commuting zones of large urban centres and]] in the north of the country (20.0%).
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CHANGED ACCORDING TO THE REVIEWER'S SUGGESTION (3.2 MAGNITUDE OF THE PHENOMENON, PAR.4).

As well, the extraction for MacLeod et al. under the column, "Forms" remains somewhat inaccurate.

THIS HAS NOW BEEN CHANGED ACCORDING TO THE REVIEWER'S SUGGESTION (TABLE 1, MACLEOD ET AL (2014).

The reference to the Montour et al. article needs to be revised due to an inaccuracy: "In a qualitative study in rural community hospitals in Canada [[delete: and the US]] about the changing nature of nursing work, Montour et al (2009)…." As Montour et al. note, the hospitals were only in Canada. The extraction data needs to be made accurate as well.

THIS HAS NOW BEEN RECTIFIED (3.4 CONSEQUENCES OF NURSES HOLDING MULTIPLE JOBS, PAR.2). THE ERROR OF INTERPRETATION WAS DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE LOCATION OF THE STUDY (THE HAMILTON NIAGARA BRANT HALDIMAND LHIN) SEEMED TO INCLUDE ALSO FACILITIES AND POPULATIONS FROM BORDERING US COMMUNITIES).

The point made in the additional sentence, "This absence of usable quantitative datasets would call for primary research to be conducted to, first, understand qualitatively the specificities of the phenomenon, and second, to measure them qualitatively." is not sufficiently clear. The sentence needs to be reworded for clarity.

The sentence has been corrected (Discussion, par.2).