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Reviewer's report:

General
Timely review of literature; only concern was

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In discussion, would make sure all articles discussed are referenced (had trouble following which article was being discussed; not a problem earlier in manuscript)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. In discussion, would make sure you mention that major limitation may be scope of articles and criteria chosen. There may be many "best practices" published in abstracts, government reports, etc. that might have been listed but didn't meet search criteria because they didn't make it to peer review I have trouble believing these are ALL the major activities/studies done in this area; there may be other study designs, approaches, case reports, etc., that would be helpful for people in the field. By the same token, it should be made clear this may not be all that is out there.

2. Might also put in discussion a piece about benchmarking. Do all quality improvement initiatives have a rigorous evidence-base behind them? My guess is that that is not the case, and I would hope we are not holding QI efforts targeting disparities to a different standard.

3. Tables were difficult to track and read. Any way to simplify and combine would surely assist the reader (I found myself spreading both tables out on my desk, along with the manuscript and references so I could see which particular article and intervention was being discussed).

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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