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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

It was unclear how 6400 papers were excluded, this section could be expanded. Also, do you have any data on the agreement of your raters (e.g. Kappa Score)? While it is true that quality improvement is usually messy and not well controlled (this is really not new information), that is also what differentiates quality improvement from formal research. Usually these papers are a description of a clinical improvement effort rather than a formally funded research effort; I would like to hear more about what you did learn about quality and safety improvement – even if it is not perfect science. For example, is there a way to count specific types of change or improvement techniques that lead to improved outcomes? In other words can you go beyond your disappointment in the design and quality of these studies and give us some new information?

- Minor Essential Revisions

Page 5, last sentence in paragraph 1, “impacts” should be “impact”

- Discretionary Revisions

None
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