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Many thanks for the opportunity to review the manuscript 'An overview of systematic reviews on the collaboration between physicians and nurses and the impact on patient outcomes. What can we learn in primary care?' Physician nurse collaboration in primary care is an important area of inquiry in systematic review and secondary research.
I have some significant concerns about the manuscript in its current form.
The abstract is rather confusing and requires re-writing to align with the re-written manuscript. The background contains a focus on the ageing population, increases in chronic disease and consequent greater demand on healthcare systems. There is no background information about physician nurse collaboration. The aim of the study requires re-writing. As far as I am aware, the term overview is not used with reviews of reviews. The term meta-review is used. What kind of systematic reviews were included? Were only reviews of randomised controlled trial studies sought? What were the collaboration interventions and outcomes? The results do not make sense to me as the conceptualisation of collaboration and detail regarding outcomes are not specified. The conclusions are similarly unclear.
The introduction/background does not provide a clear rationale for the study or for the inclusion criteria leading to a clear aim for the meta-review. What is understood by collaboration? What outcomes were targeted and why? These details are necessary for the reader to make sense of the methods, results, and discussion. Why is this meta-review necessary? The focus in many studies on a particular condition or pathophysiological problem is not a reason for this meta-review. What is the review problem? This requires careful articulation in the background based in relevant literature.
The methods are unclear. The authors are advised to consult standard conventions for reporting methods in systematic reviews such as the Cochrane Collaboration. Perhaps consult some published papers as examples to assist in improving reporting of methods such as - Mistaien P, Francke A, Poot E. 'Interventions aimed at reducing problems in adult patients discharged from hospital to home: systematic meta-review' BMC Health Services Research 20017, 7: 47. There is no clear explanation of the inclusion criteria, the selection of dates for review inclusion are not justified. The design of reviews to be included is not presented for example were only reviews of RCTs included? How was interprofessional collaboration conceptualised or operationalised in this study? How was the setting understood?
The results are unclear due to difficulties noted above. Reviews are included across diverse practice areas including transitional care and cancer screening. How is the reader to make sense of this? Are the author suggesting that the focus of care is not relevant? Which kinds of nurses were included? Nurses can be care attendants, licensed to practice nurses, registered nurses or
advanced practice nurses. Each kind of nurse is educationally prepared in quite different ways and it makes no sense to group all nurses together. Much of the results reads like discussion as it includes sentences that are interpreting information. Consult accepted guidelines re reporting of results.

The discussion requires re-writing. What has been found and what does this mean in terms of existing literature? How do the findings expand on the current knowledge base? What are the implications for practice?

The written English requires re-crafting in many areas.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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