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Influencing factors of speaking up for patient safety among hospital based healthcare professionals: an integrative review

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The authors have conducted a comprehensive review of healthcare literature examining factors that influence the occurrence of speaking up, that is voicing concerns or ideas—a highly important behavior in healthcare. This is an important paper and I fully appreciate the effort and work of meticulously analyzing the literature. In its current version, however, I do not yet see how the authors integrate their review findings into existing literature as well extend the literature by proving clear implications for research and practice. Please find below some suggestions and questions that need to be addressed in the revision.

Abstract:
- I think that there is already broad knowledge on “influencing factors” of speaking behavior (e.g., recent papers by Morrison). From my point of view, the authors should provide their rationale why this review is necessary (e.g., Particular focus on healthcare? Identify contradictory findings? Identify further research needs and implication for practice? Evaluate the quality of existing literature? )
- What will the reader learn in this paper and how will it help him/her to focus his/her research and/or clinical work?

Background:
- p. 4: I suggest integrating the two paragraphs into on because I see some redundancy.
- p. 5: As stated above, from the current description I do not yet understand what this review will add to current literature. I suggest formulating precise goals of this paper.
- I think there are theories and models of voice behavior (e.g., by Morrison) and extensive qualitative research on barriers of speaking up (e.g., by Detert & Edmondson). I think the authors could use this work to shape their analysis instead examining the literature in a very explorative way. Doing so would, from my point of view, help to identify and explicate potentially ambiguous findings,
and thus, advance the science of speaking up by identifying research needs.

Methods:
- I suggest moving the definition of speaking up to the Background and also providing respective references.
- There are some sentences that seem somewhat separate from the overall flow of the manuscript (e.g., p. 7: “This study focuses on communication between health care professionals within .... “).
- p. 8: I am not sure what the authors mean with “integrative review with a diverse sampling frame”.
- p. 8: The authors describe that they used criteria to assess the quality of the studies they reviewed. In the Results I did not find any results of this quality assessment – which I think would be very interesting. Based on the findings reported in Table 1, the methods applied in the primary studies vary a lot (and presumably so does their quality), I think this should be explicitly taken into account in the interpretation and into the development of further research needs.
- p. 9: What type of content analysis was used for what purpose and based on which literature? Where are the results?

Results
- In the Title the authors preview “influencing factors” whereas in the Results I also see findings reported on the relationship between speaking up and outcome variables. I think the authors offer than more their title suggests and I wonder whether the title could be changed to reflect this.
- Similarly, on p. 10 and 11 the authors report findings on “speaking up for patient safety” (not sure what this phrase previews) and “the effect of ‘speaking up’ training, both of which go beyond what they have announced in the Background of their manuscript. I suggest clarifying the goals of the paper.
- Regarding the presentation of the factors influencing speaking up, I strongly recommend to embed the findings into existing models (see my comment above) which would also allow for integrating Table 1 and Table 2. So far, I do not understand how Table 2 is related to the findings of the literature review.

Discussion:
- I suggest shaping the discussion to a) evaluate the current state of research based on the review findings, b) identify issues that are well-studied and those that are not; c) identify precise research needs, d) if possible, develop implications for practice.
- I also think the authors should describe what their review adds to the current literature.

I am looking forward to the revision!
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