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BMC Health Service Research
BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8HB,

Dear Dr Yun-Hee Jeon,

Thank you for reviewing and requesting a third revision of our manuscript ‘Patient neglect in healthcare institutions: A systematic review and conceptual model’ for BMC Health Services Research.

We have attempted to fully address the observation regarding our assessments of the quality of the papers/studies included in the review. I have attached the response below. I have uploaded the revised paper, and also the supporting documents.

We would like to thank you again for helping us to enhance the quality of the review, and look forward to your response. If you have any further questions regarding the manuscript, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Reader
Please find below our responses to the comments made by the reviewer in their assessment of the paper ‘Patient neglect in healthcare institutions: A systematic review and conceptual model’. References to page and paragraph numbers indicate where changes have been made to the manuscript (in red font) in response to reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer 3

1 “What is clearly lacking I can point out is the fact the authors have not addressed the quality appraisal process. They have described (in the figure 1) the eligibility criteria which appear to have no mention of quality of the papers/studies. The authors may be asked to address this.”

Because the field of patient neglect remains a quite unchartered one, with relatively few papers directly approaching the topic, it did not seem prudent to limit our selection of papers according to quality. Instead, we included papers/reports if they had ‘data’ on patient neglect (i.e. they were not opinion pieces). However, we agree with the reviewer that an assessment of quality is important. To this end, we have retrospectively assessed the quality of the data in each publication using the SIGN guidelines (guidelines for assessing the quality of papers in systematic reviews). Hopefully, this addresses the issue surrounding the quality assessment of research included in the review.

It can be seen that, generally, the papers do not report especially high quality data in terms of causal relationships, and instead focus on case studies and surveys. This is not surprising given the nature of the issue being investigated, yet does highlight a lack of rigour in the field of patient neglect (and we have mentioned this in the discussion).

Pages that have been changed include: 7, 8, 9, 10, 29, 38-40 (changes marked in red font).