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Reviewer's report:

Summary: The authors conduct a systematic review of the literature on interventions in improving team effectiveness. The proposed typology follows their 2008 article and includes types of interventions, types of teams, and quality of evidence. The gap filled is a broader review with prior work being either detailed at the specific intervention or specific team or outcomes targeted. The two overarching goals are to search for empirically based interventions and to assess which ones are evidence based. Having a systematic review in this topic area is important and the authors develop a good framework and deep analysis. In particular the results of the Training section are a good synopsis on training (CRM and TeamSTEPPS) and Tools (SBAR etc). The implication section details major gaps which is very well developed and important for the literature. The "limited innovation" could be refined as the gray literature and other areas likely cover this - consider refining or dropping. Overall the review is well done and important to the literature. Some refinements as listed below are necessary for the paper to be accepted.

Major

- It is unclear if the interventions included are targeting only effectiveness as stated in the abstract or general performance outcomes. There is a incongruency between the stated objectives in the abstract and the search terms employed in the search strategy (p 6), the former being specific, the latter being more general.

- If the goal is to broadly study the interventions on team effectiveness, the authors might expand their "team" search term to include other team-based terms, i.e., microsystems, pods, groups, patient centered medical home, etc.

- In the background section include a definition of key terms, i.e., teams, effectiveness, PRISMA. In particular more detail is needed on "effectiveness" since the overall findings appear to be broader than the strict use of effectiveness in the Org Behavior literature.
How was the organization into subcategories conducted (p 9,10). The process is not clear and stated generally, more detail is needed.

The third aspect of the categorization (organizational interventions (programs and redesign) are not clear. Is the intent to go from micro to macro, so organizational impacts, are the first two categories not also macro? Providing a clearer definition for this category is necessary.

Minor

Abstract Results Section: Three types of interventions are set up then only 2 are listed.

Grammar mistakes and awkward sentence structures are common throughout the article.

If empirical and evidence based interventions are the focus, why exclude students - often studies use students as a way to control the environment and improve reliability and validity?

What is the PRISMA format (p 8).

Consider renaming the 3rd category (interventions) on p 10 since this is the overarching goal of the review and is confusing compared to trainings and tools. Consider adding a reason for why interventions fall into trainings, tools, and 3rd category.

P 17 - at the top the description of what the organizational interventions are is not clear. . operational level would include structure and process?

Limitation section uses colloquial language (from scratch, found every single study).
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