

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The role of organisational and cultural factors in the implementation of system-wide interventions in acute hospitals to improve patient outcomes: protocol for a systematic literature review
AUTHORS	Nosrati, Hadis; Clay-Williams, Robyn; Cunningham, Frances; Hillman, Ken; Braithwaite, Jeffrey

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Assoc Prof Paul Dugdale Director Centre for Health Stewardship Australian National University Australia No competing interests
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Nov-2012

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors may wish to expand the discussion of aspects of hospital culture relating to the key messages, eg by referencing medical anthropology literature about hospital culture (eg Strong M. 'Ceremonial order of the clinic'; Garfinkel's essay 'Good clinical reasons for bad clinical records'; or Goffman's seminal work 'Asylums'). Although this literature is not in scope for the search, it could help clarify the theoretical perspective on organisations that the systematic review is taking.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Naomi Fulop Professor of Health Care Organisation and Management UCL UK No competing interests
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Dec-2012

THE STUDY	<p>While this is an important topic, the research question isn't clear. In the introduction, the authors appear to be focussing on organisation-wide interventions to recognise and manage deteriorating patients. However, subsequently the remit of the systematic review they are proposing appears much broader - they need to clarify this and explicitly set out the research question they are proposing to address.</p> <p>The authors should set out how this review will complement and add to other related ones e.g. Kaplan et al (2010) Shekelle et al (2010)</p>
------------------	--

	The review is excluding qualitative studies - the authors should explain why and discuss limitations of doing this.
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 (Assoc Prof Paul Dugdale) comments

The authors may wish to expand the discussion of aspects of hospital culture relating to the key messages, eg by referencing medical anthropology literature about hospital culture (eg Strong M. 'Ceremonial order of the clinic'; Garfinkel's essay 'Good clinical reasons for bad clinical records'; or Goffman's seminal work 'Asylums'). Although this literature is not in scope for the search, it could help clarify the theoretical perspective on organisations that the systematic review is taking.

Authors' response

We thank the reviewer for his suggestion, and we have reviewed the suggested medical anthropology literature relating to clinical culture, however as this literature does not specifically relate to hospital culture, we have not made reference to it in this protocol. However, depending on the results of the systematic review, it may be appropriate to refer to such broader references in the write-up of the actual systematic review, rather than in this protocol.

Reviewer 2 (Prof Naomi Fulop) comments

While this is an important topic, the research question isn't clear. In the introduction, the authors appear to be focussing on organisation-wide interventions to recognise and manage deteriorating patients. However, subsequently the remit of the systematic review they are proposing appears much broader - they need to clarify this and explicitly set out the research question they are proposing to address.

Authors' response

To clarify the research question and how the review relates to our interest in MET interventions we have expanded the introduction.

Reviewer 2 (Prof Naomi Fulop) comments

The authors should set out how this review will complement and add to other related ones e.g. Kaplan et al (2010), Shekelle et al (2010)

Authors' response

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. Although the Shekelle et al (2010) study may not be directly within the scope of our systematic review protocol, we have included reference to the Kaplan et al. (2010) paper in the Introduction (added to Introduction, last para).

Reviewer 2 (Prof Naomi Fulop) comments

The review is excluding qualitative studies - the authors should explain why and discuss limitations of doing this.

Authors' response

We have structured the systematic review protocol to identify studies where there is high quality evidence and validated data. We have therefore not included studies relying solely on qualitative data, although some studies within the search may employ both qualitative and quantitative data collection.