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Dear Editors,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript: *An evaluation of methods used to teach quality improvement to undergraduate healthcare students to inform curriculum development within pre-registration nurse education*. A protocol for Systematic Review and Narrative Synthesis.

We would like to take this opportunity in thanking both the Editorial Team and peer reviewer Professor Huw Davies for their time given to review this protocol for a second time. We are very grateful to have received such comprehensive and constructive feedback from this level of expertise and have confidence the revised protocol has once again been strengthened as a result.

As requested a point-by-point response to each of the concerns mentioned will now be provided and can be viewed through tracked changes in the Revised Protocol:

**Response to Professor Huw Davies**

1. Uncertainty as to the adoption of a ‘Realist’ synthesis was raised, in particular to the utility of poorer quality studies to formulate CMO configurations. The authors’ intentions were to utilise the eligible studies retrieved from the new search here. On reflection however, the authors do agree that this still may prove difficult and have decided to proceed with a Narrative Synthesis.
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2. The inclusion of a discussion regarding ‘curriculum development’ within the background section was emphasised. The authors confirm that they are evaluating teaching methods to inform curriculum development within pre-registration nursing and consider both concepts an important point of discussion within the background section.

3. It was highlighted that the new Quality Appraisal section was not clear in how this would shape the synthesis. This was an oversight by the authors and has now been added to this section (low graded papers will be excluded).
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4. Concerns over the Data Synthesis being vague were raised. The authors have provided a more detailed account of the framework and methods within this section.

Again, we would like to express our gratitude in having the opportunity to improve our protocol using the feedback provided. We look forward to hearing from you in due time regarding the revisions made and to answer any further question you may have.

Kind regards,

Lorraine Armstrong

Clinical Academic Fellow