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Reviewer's report:

This is a useful contribution to scientists seeking to undertake systematic reviews (I envision using a revised version of this paper in some of my classes). In general, a bit more detail would be helpful to maximize impact. For example, the authors write:

"However, there is general acceptance of certain steps being required in a systematic review of any evidence type and these should be used to distinguish between a literature review and a systematic review."

While a citation is provided, including some examples in the text would be helpful.

Similarly, a bit more specific guidance of when NOT to follow through on a systematic review would be useful.

Some reference to the MOOSE guidelines for observational studies would also be appropriate, as would the article "Protocol-developing meta-ethnography reporting guidelines (eMERGe)", published in this very journal.

I do think it might be worth at least acknowledging the somewhat artificial division presented here (and in many of these approaches) between qualitative and qualitative data (and the fact that there are no standardized approaches that allow for the incorporation of both types of data). Can quantitative data not capture information on why an intervention is not adopted, even when shown to be effective? Can qualitative data contribute nothing of use on outcomes? This is not a divide created by the authors, but by the scientific community, and is worthy of at least comment in this paper.
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