

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Realising their potential? Exploring inter-professional perceptions and potential of the Advanced Practitioner role - a qualitative analysis.
AUTHORS	Jones, Aled; Powell, Tom; Watkins, Dianne; Kelly, Daniel

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Kay Currie Glasgow Caledonian University Scotland, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Sep-2015

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>An interesting and well written paper, adding to the existing literature by considering the views of a range of stakeholders. Occasional minor typographical errors; table 1 should be referred to in text.</p> <p>Further detail or supporting references on analysis is required; whilst many readers may be aware of the principles of thematic analysis, others may not, and the current limited description of the steps in analysis impedes evaluation of the rigour of the study.</p> <p>Findings are well presented, with effective use of participant quotes to illustrate themes. The discussion and conclusions are relevant, with clear recommendations based on study findings.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Virginia Plummer Monash University Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Sep-2015

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Well written paper on a contemporary topic. A few points for clarification;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this part of a larger study? There is reference to mixed methods on page four and qualitative methods on page five. 2. ? 'unprecedented' -line 1 page 6 3. The discussion on standardisation appears to be left hanging, can a specialist have unique and skilfully developed inter professional practise? 4. The authors may consider AP roles and their future practice to full potential, yet may regular nurses and paramedics and allied health staff and their employers may feel they are yet to optimise their roles. Comment only. 5. Are there any study limitations when interpreting the findings?
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Dr Currie

Table 1 should be referred to in text - table 1 has now been referred to

Further detail or supporting references on analysis is required etc - thanks and we agree fully with your comments here. Further details have been provided in the data collection and analysis sections of the paper.

Dr Plummer

1. Was this part of a larger study? There is reference to mixed methods on page four and qualitative methods on page five - the mistaken reference to mixed methods has been removed. This was a stand-alone study and not part of a larger study.
2. ? 'unprecedented' -line 1 page 6 - this has been corrected
3. The discussion on standardisation appears to be left hanging, can a specialist have unique and skilfully developed inter professional practise? We have added further detail as a result of this useful comment (see p.13). We have attempted to portray APs of the future as needing a blend of specialist and standardised skills and practise, which we think is supported by our data but not fully developed in the original submission.
4. The authors may consider AP roles and their future practice to full potential, yet may regular nurses and paramedics and allied health staff and their employers may feel they are yet to optimise their roles. Comment only - Thanks also for this observation and suggestion. Optimisation is a useful word in relation to our findings and we have included a comment including this in the conclusion.
5. Are there any study limitations when interpreting the findings? Study limitations were added in text box in the original submission.