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Reviewer's report:

This paper presents well and makes a substantial contribution to the literature. There are just a few remaining minor suggestions/comments:

1. Page 4 L83-6 - capitalising the first letter of each described component of the VIPS framework would help to show that this is the 'definition' of the acronym
2. P4 L 86-7 - If 'in the hospital setting' was in parenthesis, the sentence might be clearer
3. Page 6 typo L36 - 'about' should be 'out'
4. Page 7 L 153 - the references for these seven papers should be provided to add clarity for the reader
5. Page 10 L 222-3 - tense is inconsistent
6. Page 13, L 301 - reference needed after 'falls'.
7. Page 16, L 361 - The comment about included studies actually refers to the number of papers, which is not the same thing. Suggest rewording.
8. Page 16, line 380 - apostrophe needed for 'relatives'
9. Page 17, L392 - recognises should be 'recognise'
10. Page 19, L433 - sentence would be clearer if 'carers' was used instead of 'they'
11. Figure 1 - please review figures in the bottom right hand-box for accuracy
12. Please consider either retitling Figure 2 or clarifying that it refers to communication and information sharing with carers and carers' relationships with hospital staff (see 'staff interactions')
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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