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Review

Thank you for the opportunity to review your work. Any paper which seeks to clarify the value and complexity of nursing roles is important. I enjoyed reading this paper. I believe it can be improved with the following changes and clarifications:

P4, L11-12 refer to table with questions here in the text.

P4: Methods

The use of a hermeneutic framework is interesting and useful. However, there are instances where what is written does is not consistent:

L37 you state that only peer-reviewed papers were included, yet line 46-47 you also note the inclusion of grey literature, reports and position statements which are unlikely to have had a formal peer review. This requires some clarification.

L48 'it'. Please clarify what reached saturation

L48-50 Please clarify why you have written that the hermeneutic circle was broken and left at the search stage. Surely by reviewing the literature you have moved from the search and acquisition circle of the hermeneutic framework to the analysis circle. This needs to be addressed.

P4 L45. It is clearly stated that 45 papers were reviewed. However, the 45 papers are not clear either in text or in the reference list. An illustrative table containing the author details and then a column for each of the themes (or questions) and a tick to show which paper explored which
theme/question would be useful for the reader to have a better sense of the literature and how papers addressed the key issues.

**P4: Results**

This section should provide the reader with stronger links to the literature review questions shown in table 1 and how the themes link to those questions.

**P16 Figure 1** should say that it has been adapted from Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic (2010).

If these aspects are addressed this paper will be improved and this important topic further highlighted through publication.
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