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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for the interesting manuscript that I enjoyed reading. Because I teach a graduate course on managing quality with teams using as a main content process mapping and redesign, the content of the manuscript resonated with my interests. Nevertheless, for readers who are not familiar with such concepts and the international professionals, it could be better to stick to the purpose of the paper "... provides an academic perspective of both benefits ... and pitfalls...", that is to say, show clearly the benefits and the pitfalls in separate sections.

A few more comments:

Page 4, under background, paragraph 3, lines 101-102, kindly elaborate what kind of conflicts in workload.

Page 5, under "What is healthcare redesign?", is there a more updated recent definition or is the one you choose to consider?

Page 7, under "Developing partnerships", lines 155-156, please be consistent in putting a comma after the citation: Human factors such as shared vision [remove ,] (Lorden et al 2014), readiness (Al Balushi et al 2014) [put comma] leadership, assigned workload (Lorden et al 2014) [put ,] engagement and 'buy-in' (Sahs et al. 2017), ritual or resistance (Waring & Bishop 2010) ...

Page 11, under "Project deliverables/outcomes (publications)", why selecting publication only to be included in the title? Line 272, (ref) to be added; line 275, Rathmell [delete &] and Sandberg

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field
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