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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is an important work contributing to the small but growing body of scholarly work regarding Dutch NP and especially PA workforce analysis. The manuscript certainly gained even more value by the theoretical framework that has been included, creating clarity about the terms that at times are used interchangeably. Next to that, the work offers an insight into the type of activities of NPs and PAs, i.e. not only into their clinician roles, but also to some extent regarding the additional tasks.

As authors you have written a manuscript that reads well, is clearly written and also appears to be understandable for laymen who are not involved in this type of research. Next to that you have combined an intriguing mix of methods to collect data, making it seemingly even more robust. One methodological limitation is described appropriately, i.e. data collection was confined to 'just' 4 hospitals, most probably distributed in 1-2 region(s) of The Netherlands? The outcomes of the study clearly indicates that the effect NPs and PAs have on the direct patient care is most probably of a much a higher magnitude than reported. This message seems of pivotal importance for hospital administrators to take into consideration at the point they have to decide on medical task shifting in their system(s). It's not only the RVU's that count, but also the additional task that most probably contribute to a higher (experienced) quality of care.

Please have a look at exhibit 3 (some add symbols are inserted), next to that CBV is not explained elsewhere in the text. Exhibit 6 contains a 'typo': [Task substation]
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