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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review 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 thoroughly addressed many of the reviewers’ comments and the majority of my additional comments below refer to relatively minor issues remaining with the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Similar to comments from my first review, it would be helpful if the authors inserted more examples of concepts. Though the authors did include more examples than in the original manuscript, and frequently they referred to citations of other papers, there are several areas where readability would be improved if they provided concrete examples given the complexity of the methodology (and frequent requirements of referencing tables and figures). Though the tables and figures are extremely thorough, the manuscript's readability would simply be better if more examples were included in text. For instance, in the first few sentences of the paper, it would be helpful if the authors identified a specific example of a CQI intervention. Similarly, under the Terminology section, it would be helpful to insert specific examples as different ‘domains’ are described.

2. Further, under Taxonomy Development (pg 12), more specific examples would be helpful. For instance, “…in Stage 2 was used (i) to identify factors that were missing from our initial framework (and hence, the taxonomy) such as [INSERT SPECIFIC EXAMPLE HERE] and (ii) to determine how factors had been conceptualized. The initial taxonomy was revised to incorporate new factors and prevailing conceptualisations, such as [INSERT ONE NEW FACTOR HERE; INSERT ONE PREVAILING CONCEPTUALISATION HERE]…”

3. The paragraphs under the heading ‘Description of the CQI use and implementation domain’ are confusing. This appears to be in part because ‘CQI use and implementation’ refers to an overarching domain, as well as to subdomains (e.g., it appears there are specific measures for ‘use of CQI’ as well as for constructs that fall under the ‘use of CQI’ domain. It may be less confusing to reword the domain title something more broad.

4. The authors specifically mentioned that instruments measuring fidelity to CQI methods were limited, though they did not revisit this issue in the Future
Directions section of the Discussions. Given the importance of fidelity measures to most intervention implementation projects, the authors should list/revisit this issue in the Future Directions section.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. Given the complexity of the domain for organizational climate and culture, the authors may want to consider grouping instruments into those that specifically measure org climate, separate from org culture, and separate from a combined org climate + culture category. This would reduce the need to section out items individually
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