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Author’s response to reviews:

The authors thank the reviewers for their detailed review of our manuscript, and the opportunity for us to strengthen it by additions or clarification.

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer #1:
You have researched a very important topic globally and your findings are most valuable for policy development in many countries. Thank you. However, it seems to me that your effort to press your findings of qualitative data into May's Implementation theory makes for cumbersome reading. Why did you feel it is necessary? It makes your findings and conclusions difficult to understand for an international readership. Please see additions commencing line 152. While we agree implementation science is complex, it provides a necessary framework for translation, and where necessary, adaption, for other settings. Your qualitative data clearly identify answers to the two research questions you pose. They tell us that communication with institution staff and MDs is often difficult; that there are legal and reimbursement barriers; that roles need to be clarified and possibly 'worked at' in order to avoid 'deskilling' of staff; that resistance of MDs needs to be addressed; that there are considerable benefits in terms of quality of life and health outcomes for old persons etc... These are findings which are important also for other countries. Thank you. May's theory might be most useful, alas, I can not see, why it is needed for a qualitative study. Implementation science in describing interventions is encouraged by the WHO. Please see additions commencing line 152 for a better explanation of why we utilised this framework. It would be helpful to have a footnote explaining the MBS subsidy scheme. A footnote is now added on page 7. This is an important addition for international audiences – thank you.
Reviewer #2:
An interesting article that adds to the NP in long term care literature. There is already some literature in this field which you did not acknowledge in your background. You may wish to go back and search a bit more.

Some examples include:
For example, a systematic review of the effectiveness of advanced practice nurses in long term care by Donald et al.; Kaaslalainen et al., 2010; Clare, 2010, etc.

There is also a PEPPA framework to guide NP implementation by Bryant-Lukosius. The authors were able to access the following manuscripts by Donald et al and Bryant-Lukosius. J Adv Nurs. 2013 Oct;69(10):2148-61. doi: 10.1111/jan.12140. Epub 2013 Mar 25.


A framework for the introduction and evaluation of advanced practice nursing roles.

Bryant-Lukosius D1, DiCenso A. International literature describes various models of advanced practice nurses, however it is not easy to visualize the different practice models and their components (such as legislative differences) to understand if they are equivalent roles to nurse practitioners in Australia. For this reason we did not draw heavily on the international literature and even limited the Australian literature on this topic to gain a contemporary account of practice. Also in the background, the paragraph that starts on line 46 seems like it should come first addressing broad aged care needs. Thank you.

This has been moved to line 31 as the introduction. I did not see how you clearly addressed the 2nd purpose of the study which was to to identify how stakeholders define the success of the OPNP role. Thank you.

Reference to this has been removed, as stakeholders were not asked this directly. The questions asked of participants are stated in line 129-131 and include the experience of implementing an OPNP and barriers and enablers to the implementation. Success was extrapolated to enablers in the analysis, but as this was not defined the reference to this has been deleted.

In table 2, what is the difference between public sector and not for profit? Thank you.

This clarity is important for an international audience. The terms are now defined in lines 117-120. I have one question regarding the methodology - were they asked about implementation of the NP in the initial stages or now, given that some of them have had NPs in place for several years?

This is an important distinction for the interpretation of the results. Implementation is an ongoing process until normalisation into practice is achieved (or not), and each organisation varies in this respect. Implementation involves many complex aspects, some aspects (such as material resources) can be achieved quickly, others taking long periods and being cyclic in nature (such as reflexive monitoring). Participants were not asked about initial operationalisation, but ongoing implementation through questions about barriers and enablers. Participants demonstrate that they understood this (see the first quote in column 2 and second quote column 4 in Table 3 which reflects past and current
experience). There are also some minor editorial and grammatical corrections required. The manuscript has been further examined and edited to correct grammatical errors.