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Response to Reviewers’ Comments_SYSR-D-19-00413

We thank the editorial team and the reviewers for their considered feedback. Please see our response below:

1. COMMENT

Background: a clear description of the research field. Sometimes it is not clear if the aspects are author’s opinions or if they describe other study results. Marking this would improve the text. The aim is described in the first part of the method section, perhaps a better place at the end of the background section.

RESPONSE

We agree. The sentence at the beginning of the methods section outlining the aims of the review has been moved to the end of the background section (p. 5) and two paragraphs in the background (p. 4) have been edited for clarity.

2. COMMENT

METHODS

"Inclusion criteria: A modified version of the SPIDER (Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation, Research Type) formula for qualitative research will be used in lieu of the PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) framework to help formulate the research

Cooke 2012 concluded: "However, more work is required to refine this new search strategy tool—for example, by compiling a test set of documents so that a known estimate of sensitivity can be calculated. [...] In addition, more development and testing of the SPIDER tool with a wide range of qualitative research topics are needed before it can be considered a viable alternative to PICO for retrieving qualitative research."

Metheley 2014 [Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO, PICOS and SPIDER: a comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for qualitative systematic reviews. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14:579.] concluded: "The recommendations for practice are therefore to use the PICO tool for a fully comprehensive search [...] the SPIDER tool would not be recommended due to the risk of not identifying relevant papers, but has potential due to its greater specificity."

After reading the conclusions of Cooke 2012 and Metheley 2014, it does not look appropriate to use SPIDER in lieu of PICO. Furthermore, Metheley 2014 is not discussed in the manuscript.

RESPONSE

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have included an additional sentence in the Inclusion Criteria section (p. 6) explaining that the SPIDER framework was selected because of its specificity in identifying Conversation Analytic studies when compared to the PICO tool. The citation suggested by the reviewer (Methley et al., 2014) now appears in the manuscript (p. 6, p. 19).

3. METHODS

"Search strategy: The electronic databases to be searched include: Other sources: Grey literature searching (Open Grey, Cochrane Handbook, Australian National Library, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Mednar, Grey Literature Report, Grey Literature Network)"

COMMENT

The Cochrane Handbook provides guidance to authors for the preparation of Cochrane intervention reviews. It is not designed to be source for primary clinical data.

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality develops evidence reports and technology assessments on topics relevant to clinical and other health care organization and delivery issues among others issues. It is not designed to be source for primary clinical data.

RESPONSE
We agree. The Cochrane Handbook and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality have been removed from the grey literature search strategy (p. 10).

4. COMMENT

METHODS

"Search strategy: The full search strategy will be reported in the follow-up publication."

I am not sure whether this matches the PRISMA-P. I expect all predefined and planned search strategies to be reported in the submitted protocol.

Two headings "methods" are irritating.

RESPONSE

The second “methods” heading (p. 9) was included in error in the submitted manuscript and has been removed.

5. COMMENT

METHODS

"Study selection: Citations of the included studies will be registered in the JBI System for the Unified Management, Assessment, and Retrieval of Information (JBI SUMARI [26])."


RESPONSE

Reference to the JBI SUMARI has been removed and replaced with “Covidence systematic review management software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) will be used to remove duplicates, conduct screening, and securely store data for future updates of the review” (p. 11). We have included the relevant citation from the Cochrane Handbook as suggested by the reviewer.

6. COMMENT

DISCUSSION
Section may not be appropriate in a protocol.

RESPONSE

The Systematic Reviews submission guidelines for protocols specify that the discussion “should include a discussion of any practical or operational issues involved in performing the study and any issues not covered in other sections”. We believe that the discussion section provides a necessary recapitulation of the key objectives of the review. It also includes a brief discussion of the knowledge translation and dissemination strategies, strengths, and limitations of the review not previously covered in other sections of the manuscript. The discussion section (pp. 13-14) has been edited for brevity and clarity.

7. COMMENT

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

Section may not be appropriate in a protocol.

RESPONSE

Please see our response above.

8. COMMENT

TABLE 1. SEARCH TERMS USING SPIDER HEADINGS.

Concerning PubMed, some text words are combined with Boolean operators OR, AND. Controlled terms are missing, though, there are various terms available, for example: "Communication"[Mesh], "Counseling"[Mesh], "Aged"[Mesh].

RESPONSE

We thank the reviewer for this comment. MeSH terms and controlled terms (field codes) with truncation are now presented in Table 1.