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Measuring organisational and individual factors thought to influence the success of Quality Improvement in primary care: a systematic review of instruments Sue E Brennan, Marije Bosch, Heather Buchan and Sally Green

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to review the revised version of the manuscript entitled, “Measuring organisational and individual factors thought to influence the success of Quality Improvement in primary care: a systematic review of instruments”. The authors have done an excellent job carefully considering and attempting to address each point made in the initial review. The authors retained the initial strengths in the revised manuscript and have addressed the previously identified weaknesses. One of the major themes throughout the initial review had to do with the challenge of clearly communicating the complexities of this huge undertaking. In response to these reviews, the authors have improved the organization and structure in the revised manuscript. The authors have also clarified the specific focus of this manuscript while simultaneously providing sufficient detail regarding the broader framework of the project as a whole. They answered all of the questions I raised in my review about the methodological issues (e.g., developing the conceptual framework, identifying the taxonomy, selecting and employing the COSMIN, data extraction methods). The authors also addressed concerns regarding complex sentence structure which has improved the readability of the manuscript. I now have only a few remaining minor discretionary revisions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

N/A

Minor Essential Revisions

N/A

Discretionary Revisions

1. Consider rephrasing the fifth aim on page 6 to more accurately reflect the objectives of the COSMIN application which is to rate the “methods used during instrument development and testing” (clearly articulated on page 14) as opposed
to rating the measurement properties of the instrument itself. The current wording of aim 5 makes this distinction less clear.

2. The authors are not consistent in their use of terms to refer to “instruments”, “measures”, “measurement instruments”, and “assessments”. Perhaps utilizing one term consistently (e.g., “instrument” which is included in the glossary) throughout would make for greater clarity.

3. Does “InQuIRe” stand for anything? If so, please define.

4. Figure 2 is slightly confusing in its current form. Is each level of the text meant to be a separate construct? I wonder if a table with 3 columns representing each level would make the case more clearly.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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