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Reviewer’s report:

It has been interesting to read the article, the focus seems justified and important to understand how care bundles can be designed and implemented in acute care settings generally. It is useful to note that a gap is the limited patient involvement in care bundle design and implementation. My expertise is not in quantitative research nor care bundles as a topic so I do not provide comment on the quantitative aspects of the paper nor the topic. Another reviewer will need to provide comment on those elements of the paper.

My main suggestions on the article to be addressed prior to acceptance are:

1. The title would suggest to me that qualitative studies would have been included and discussed in the review as they often capture in greater richness what helps and hinders the process of the design and implementation of evidence-based interventions. They are not included so could emphasise that this takes a quantitative perspective (compliance and complexity of the implementation strategy) and provide a stronger rationale as to why chosen this approach to understanding the research activity in this area and potential gaps to be addressed. You might also want to revisit whether you address all the review questions posed in this paper as noted on p6.

2. The description and rationale for the method of review chosen. In particular the type of review undertaken and revisiting what type of review this is and strengthen the rationale for choosing a scoping review, particularly as the protocol suggests a systematic review. Further guidance on scoping reviews has been published since Arksey and O'Malley notably the Joanna Briggs Institute scoping review guidance in 2017 and Tricco et al published a PRISMA extension for scoping reviews in 2018 (references noted below for information). I would refer to these and the following article by Grant and Booth A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. Health Info Libr J. 2009 Jun;26(2):91-108. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x.

Joanne Briggs Guidance:


PRISMA ScR Checklist:


3. Was screening done by two reviewers or just one? Greater rigour if two so worth commenting on this in the limitations section.

4. p9. Lines 217-8 could be clearer about how you treated strategies if there was more than one in a study as not sure what you did from this description.

5. In the results it would be useful to report the countries the studies were undertaken.

6. P17-18 There is the StraRI checklist for reporting which aims to help improve the reporting of implementation strategies in studies which could refer to in the discussion.

7. A scoping review is about understanding further research activity in an area, identifying gaps in knowledge and potential systematic reviews which you could attend to more in the paper and conclusions - the references above may help thinking further on this in relation to care bundles.
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