Reviewer’s report

Title: INTERVENTIONS TO IMPROVE TEAM EFFECTIVENESS WITHIN HEALTH CARE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE PAST DECADE

Version: 0 Date: 05 Apr 2019

Reviewer: Prisca AC Zwanikken

Reviewer's report:

Overall the authors have done a remarkable amount of work; searching for all the articles and reviewing all those, really a lot of work.

Nevertheless hereby some comments to improve the article:

Methods:

- Page 7: Why exclude literature reviews? You included already some literature reviews, which were known to you, but were there no other literature reviews? Please clarify this exclusion criterion.

- Please clarify why you excluded "Intervention in order to improve collaboration between teams from different organizations were also eliminated" - in health care these teams can be very important, for example during large scale crises where different health care organisations are involved etc.

- Page 8 states that 297 articles were included in the review, however page 9 states a final set of 166. Can you please clarify?

- The text discusses the categorization of about 150 (3x5) articles, however table 2 shows 297 articles. Please elaborate.

Analysis:

- In the analysis, the authors refer to "non-technical skills". Do the authors mean that includes teamwork skills or are there other skills included as well? As this term is being used throughout the article it would be good to provide a definition of what is implied with "non-technical skills" and how it is similar of different from team skills.
- The authors made subcategories for certain interventions. However some are not very clear, please provide definitions and explanations what are the differences, including (additional) references.

- For example what is the difference between an educational training and a general team building training: doesn't a general team building also have an educational goal (how to work together better) in mind?

- What is the difference between a tool which improves and a tool which facilitates teamwork? If the tool only facilitates teamwork: should those articles, given the goal of the study (improvement of teamwork) have been included?

- In the results the authors show the type of results and the level of evidence. In addition it would be good to clarify the combination of the two: i.e. which have good or bad results with high level of evidence and the other way around.

- As for quality of evidence (page 11): you mention that action research is increasingly in use: what implications did that have for the quality of evidence?

- Please insert a sentence on page 11 in between the overall findings and then the findings per group of articles, to introduce to the reader that you know will discuss the group of articles.

- As for "tools" what were the levels of evidence for the other studies?

- As for facilitating tools, one study is very much highlighted, however the level of evidence is not reported- leaving the reader unsure how to judge this study in comparison to the other studies

- As for a few other methods the analysis of the results is unclear, f.e. under technology

- The discussion provides a summary and comparing the different types of interventions. Only those which provide good outcomes with high evidence were mentioned, it would be good to learn which interventions were the least effective, with high evidence.
The discussion could be refined based on the above suggestions

Editing:
- Abstract: many disturbing abbreviations in it.
- Please check numbering in abstract: 1=training, 2=tools, 3?= organizational
- Lease first time abbreviations in full (f.e. NONTECH tool page 11, SBAR)
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