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Reviewer's report:

General comment: The manuscript is well structured and written, easy to understand. It also shows strong method of the review.

Overview of the manuscript

Major concerns

1. The review is based on the framework (CAPPA) which is developed by the author team but published in another journal. It seems that this piece of the whole study is to test the developed framework rather than theoretical framework itself as stated. So, more explanation on the CAPPA and its background, how it was developed would help the paper to be more rational (Line no.41-48, page 6). In addition, "theoretical framework" stated in Line no. 50-51, page 15 should be revised.

2. Please elaborate the reasons of use/ non-use the standardized search term of each database. For example, why not use the MeSH of PubMed/MEDLINE which is the standard practice of searching.

3. What is the difference among each type of policy, especially, formal written v written standards v formal procedures; formal unwritten v informal policy? (Line no.33 to 36-37, page 6)

4. While the study included only 24 documents, reference number 20,23-35, 36-45 and 46, why reference number 47 and 48 are often mentioned in the Results (i.e. from Line number 21-22 of the second paragraph of page 7 and onward. So, how many documents included in the study, 24 or 26?)
Minor comments

1. The paper should indicate the period (published date) of the papers included in the study.
2. Please describe the screening process in the method (as shown in Figure 1).
3. Please reorder publications shown in the Additional file 2 to be in line with the reference number, stated in Line no.3 to 6-7, page 7).
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An article of importance in its field
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