

Review of: "Implementing Task Substitution for Doctors and Nurses as a Key Element of Healthcare Reform"

Godelieve Alice Goossens¹

¹ Universitair Ziekenhuis Leuven

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript requires major revisions. While the authors demonstrate expertise in the subject area, the report lacks sufficient scientific rigor and structure. The following key issues need to be addressed:

Clarity of Research Question and Methodology: The research question and the methodology are not clearly articulated. To enhance scientific rigor, the authors should explicitly state the methodology used (e.g., systematic review, narrative review) and adhere to reporting guidelines. Tables, figures, and boxes could be employed to summarize data and improve readability.

Inadequate Structure for a Scientific Publication: The current extensive listing of different topics is not appropriate for a scientific publication. The authors should aim to integrate the various elements on a meta-level to create a more cohesive narrative.

Lack of Conceptual Definitions: Key concepts are not well defined. The manuscript would benefit from the inclusion of definitions, such as those for APN and task substitution. International definitions, such as those from ICN 2020, should be utilized. For example, the ICN defines APN as encompassing more than clinical practice, including leadership competencies and the integration of research knowledge—core elements of education and role development alongside advanced practice. If the authors choose to focus solely on the clinical aspect, they should justify this limitation within the context of the role.

Quality of References: The references cited should be scientifically robust. The authors are encouraged to rely on peer-reviewed scientific publications rather than books, websites, or tabloid newspaper articles.

Weak Conclusion: The current conclusion is largely a list of points. Instead, it should provide a concise summary of the main findings, offering a clear synthesis of what was done, what was discovered, and the practical implications of these insights.

Inclusion of MeSH Terms: As much as possible, the authors should provide relevant MeSH terms for the key words.

English Grammar: The manuscript would benefit from a thorough review of its grammar and language.

