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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for the additional information they have provided in response to my comments regarding their study selection and agreement.

The additional information provided by the authors regarding the inclusion criteria for the study has raised more questions than answers for me, and I remain surprised by the number of studies excluded/small final number of included studies.

I suggest that at the minimum the authors provide a list of excluded studies with a rationale for each exclusion, more justification of the inclusion/exclusion criteria (or indeed consider revising these) and more detail of why papers were excluded. I'm particularly unsure how the 'no formal implementation data' criterion was evaluated. For example, what sorts of pre-implementation data were considered suitable for inclusion? Were all studies with pilot trial data (e.g. if this was published as a separate paper, or if a pilot paper was published) really included? Other aspects which confuse me are the rationale for including IT managers but excluding community health workers, or, what the authors mean by 'staff communication strategies' and why is this considered to be patient-focused whereas 'staff-focused interventions' are not?

A very cursory search of google scholar provides additional studies that appear to meet the authors' criteria which are not included or where it is not clear from the reasons given why they would be included, which makes me doubt the completeness of the strategy used e.g.


I strongly suggest the authors provide more clarity regarding study selection and identification.
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