

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Facilitators and barriers to the effective implementation of the individual maternal near-miss case reviews in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review of qualitative studies
AUTHORS	Lazzerini, Marzia; Ciuch, Margherita; Rusconi, Silvia; Covi, Benedetta

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Barbara Madaj Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Overall, this is a valuable piece of research, well conducted and presented which merits its publication.</p> <p>In the methodology section the terms used in the search and other criteria such as language restrictions need to be mentioned; regarding types of reviews was only maternal nearmiss the only type of review covered or did it also encompass perinatal nearmiss (this is part of discussion so if only maternal nearmiss was covered, it may be useful to explain why other nearmiss reviews should possibly be included in literature reviews or why not.</p> <p>The discussion should include more reflections on comparisons with other types of reviews and clarify the special (or not) role of nearmiss in the quality improvement methodology. To strengthen the weight of the contribution, it could be useful to include the authors ideas about possible extensions of the work done, development and use of the information generated by the literature review.</p> <p>Limitations of the study need to be discussed.</p> <p>References – the style of bibliography needs to be made consistent.</p> <p>Other specific points are listed below: p.2 line 7/8: 'This review aimed at systematically synthesizes...' – should read 'This review aimed at systematically synthesizing...' p.2 line 25: space missing between 'CSAP' and '=' p.5 line 44: 'consensus sough' should read 'consensus sought' p.6 line 23: 'varied from a maximum of minimum of' – please reword p.9 line 24: superfluous ')' sign to be taken out</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>p.9 line 27: space missing between '20,21'</p> <p>p.10 line 6: 'very broach' should (presumably) read 'broad' and please reconsider using superlatives such as 'very'</p> <p>p.10 line 37-38: 'Similarly to what reported' should read 'Similarly to what was/is/has been reported'</p> <p>p.10 line 44: 'Again, similarly to what reported' should read 'Again similarly to what was/is/has been reported'</p> <p>p.11 line 2 – 'staff turnover' – check consistency of spelling: turnover or turn-over</p> <p>p.11 line 4 'Poor patients empowerment' should read 'Poor patient empowerment'</p> <p>p.11 line 5 'implementation in both Europe, Asia and Africa' should read 'implementation in Europe, Asia and Africa'</p> <p>p.16 Table header – '§' to be also included in the Staff type column</p> <p>p.16 Staff type column – is it necessary to state 'mix'? Would it not suffice to list the types do staff?</p> <p>p.17, line 18: What does it mean 'after unsuccessfully implementation'? please revise</p> <p>Table 2 has a number of spacing, language and consistency of style and phrasing issues – please edit thoroughly</p> <p>Table 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the Hamersveld 2012 study – in column Recruitment strategy appropriate – should it not read cannot tell rather than 'No' if the footnote is correctly included? Similarly, for the entry on Have ethical issues been taken into consideration – what does the footnote ('2') mean? Please expand - For Bakker 2011 for the entry on Have ethical issues been taken into consideration – what does the footnote ('4') mean? Please expand - Column 'How valuable is the research' – please clarify what standards were used for assessing this and what the answer 'Y' means – presumably that is a Yes which is not an answer to the question <p>Table 4: please review the formatting of the table</p> <p>Table 5: includes a footnote ('5) but not explanation for what that stands for is included</p> <p>Appendix 1; p.25 line 16 '56' presumably should re ad 5,6?</p> <p>Appendix 2: please review the formatting and correct typographical errors in the table</p> <p>Figure 1 – mentions 28 grey literature studies which are not really covered in any detail in the paper – it may be useful to consider how the findings may be reported in the paper?</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Dr Bettina Bottcher
-----------------	---------------------

	Islamic University of Gaza
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for sending this interesting article to me for review. It is an interesting paper that addresses an important strategy and shows a way for effective NMRC implementation. The abstract is clearly written. The background and methods are also clear and so are the results. The discussion and conclusion are logical and make interesting as well as genuine conclusions to the systematic review. Some changes that need to be undertaken are mainly linguistic:</p> <p>page 2, line 7: replace synthesizes with synthesize page 4, line 36: replace decreased with decrease page 5, line 44: replace sough with sought page 5, line 49: add 'The' at the front of the sentence to: The quality of studies . . . page 6, lines 23 and 24: the sentence is muddled up and needs to read: Number of staff interviewed (...) and varied from a maximum of 162 (ref) to a minimum of ten (ref) people. Page 6, line 34: delete 'studies' following 'others' page 7, line 48: replace performed with perform page 8, line 40: replace barrirer with barriers page 8, line 45: replace evidenced with evidence page 8, line 43: remove 'a' from the phrase: challenge higher level staff page 9, line 4: replace manner with manners page 9, line 41/42: insert 'a' before time: . . .needing a longer time . . . page 10, line 7: replace broach with broad page 10 lines 37 and 44: The phrase 'Similarly to what reported in this review . . .' is not grammatically correct and sounds awkward. Please replace this with another phrase such as 'Similarly to what has been observed in this review . . .' or 'Similarly to what has been reported in this review . . .' or 'Similarly to what has been found in this review . . .' or 'As observed in this review, . . . page 10, line 52: replace evidenced with evidence page 10, line 54: 'As far as different types of hospitals were concerned . . .' to be replaced for the phrase written in this line.</p> <p>Conclusion: this is much improved, the focus on the process is useful, as outcomes cannot be confidently determined within this review and I am therefore in agreement with this shift of focus, which makes the paper more interesting and better.</p> <p>This is an interesting paper that focuses on review and practical implementation of NMRC. As such it comes to some obvious conclusions that are not surprising. But it is good to have this summarised as a source of reference and for improvement. It is also interesting to bring in the comparison to some of the grey literature and one way to move this topic from grey to peer reviewed journals (coloured?) literature. Therefore, I support the acceptance with minor revision despite the fact that many points in discussion and conclusion were not surprising or 'new'.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editorial Requests:

There are a number of typographical/ grammatical errors throughout the paper. Please thoroughly proofread the manuscript before submitting your revision.

*** Thank you for this point. The paper has now been checked and corrected by an English mother speaking

Please re-write the 'Strengths and limitations' section on page 2. Each bullet point should be a single sentence and relate to the methods or design of the study. It should not be a summary of the study and its findings (see: <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml#articletypes>). Please also move this section to after the abstract.

*** This has been corrected.

The Abstract >> Methods section needs to be more informative. For example, what databases were searched and what were the dates of coverage? The abstract should also include relevant sub-headings. We suggest taking a look at the PRISMA extension for abstracts (see: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/Abstracts.aspx>) and looking at other systematic review abstracts published in BMJ Open as examples. Please also change the "Findings" sub-heading to "Results".

*** We have revised the abstract following some key recommendations of the PRIMA extension for abstract. We have also checked other systematic reviews published in the last year in BMJ open, but we have found heterogeneity in reporting, with some abstract not presenting particular subheadings (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/7/8/e016242>). We are happy to further revise the abstract following a suggested structured, if any, and if needed.

Please thoroughly check your references. Reference 7 in the paper is for the PRISMA statement which is reference 8 in your reference list.

*** Thank you for this point. This has been corrected.

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Barbara Madaj

Institution and Country: Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

Competing Interests: None declared

Overall, this is a valuable piece of research, well conducted and presented which merits its publication.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

In the methodology section the terms used in the search and other criteria such as language restrictions need to be mentioned

*** This is reported in Box 1 and in the text

Regarding types of reviews was only maternal nearmiss the only type of review covered or did it also encompass perinatal nearmiss (this is part of discussion so if only maternal nearmiss was covered, it may be useful to explain why other nearmiss reviews should possibly be included in literature reviews or why not.

*** This has been clarified in the method section

The discussion should include more reflections on comparisons with other types of reviews and clarify the special (or not) role of nearmiss in the quality improvement methodology.

*** Thank you for this point, some comparisons with other reviews have been added in the discussion section

To strengthen the weight of the contribution, it could be useful to include the authors ideas about possible extensions of the work done, development and use of the information generated by the literature review.

*** Thank you for this point, some key ideas have been added in the discussion section

Limitations of the study need to be discussed.

*** This has been further expanded in the discussion section

References – the style of bibliography needs to be made consistent.

*** Thank you for this point, the reference list has now been corrected

Other specific points are listed below:

p.2 line 7/8: 'This review aimed at systematically synthesizes...' – should read 'This review aimed at systematically synthesizing...' *** corrected

p.2 line 25: space missing between 'CSAP' and '=' *** corrected

p.5 line 44: 'consensus sough' should read 'consensus sought' *** corrected

p.6 line 23: 'varied from a maximum of minimum of' – please reword *** corrected

p.9 line 24: superfluous ')' sign to be taken out *** corrected

p.9 line 27: space missing between '20,21'*** corrected

p.10 line 6: 'very broach' should (presumably) read 'broad' and please reconsider using superlatives such as 'very' *** corrected

p.10 line 37-38: 'Similarly to what reported' should read 'Similarly to what was/is/has been reported'*** corrected

p.10 line 44: 'Again, similarly to what reported' should read 'Again similarly to what was/is/has been reported' *** corrected

p.11 line 2 – 'staff turnover' – check consistency of spelling: turnover or turn-over *** corrected

p.11 line 4 'Poor patients empowerment' should read 'Poor patient empowerment' *** corrected

p.11 line 5 'implementation in both Europe, Asia and Africa' should read 'implementation in Europe, Asia and Africa' *** corrected

p.16 Table header – '§' to be also included in the Staff type column *** corrected

p.16 Staff type column – is it necessary to state 'mix'? Would it not suffice to list the types do staff? *** corrected

p.17, line 18: What does it mean 'after unsuccessfully implementation'? please revise *** corrected

Table 2 has a number of spacing, language and consistency of style and phrasing issues – please edit thoroughly *** corrected

Table 3

- For the Hamersveld 2012 study – in column Recruitment strategy appropriate – should it not read cannot tell rather than 'No' if the footnote is correctly included? Similarly, for the entry on Have ethical issues been taken into consideration – what does the footnote ('2') mean? Please expand *** corrected

- For Bakker 2011 for the entry on Have ethical issues been taken into consideration – what does the footnote ('4') mean? Please expand *** corrected

- Column 'How valuable is the research' – please clarify what standards were used for assessing this and what the answer 'Y' means – presumably that is a Yes which is not an answer to the question *** This is based on the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Research Checklist (reference 15). Specifically, criteria are: i) Consider If the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy?, or relevant research-based literature? ii) If they identify new areas where research is necessary iii) If the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered other ways the research may be used

Table 4: please review the formatting of the table *** corrected

Table 5: includes a footnote ('5) but not explanation for what that stands for is included

*** The number indicated the reference. However, since your comment suggested that this was unclear, we have specified the reference as a note

Appendix 1; p.25 line 16 '56' presumably should read 5,6? *** corrected

Appendix 2: please review the formatting and correct typographical errors in the table *** This has been revised

Figure 1 – mentions 28 grey literature studies which are not really covered in any detail in the paper – it may be useful to consider how the findings may be reported in the paper?

*** These are papers and technical report identified through the reference list of other papers. In the method section we reported 'manual search' as one of our search methods.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Dr Bettina Bottcher

Institution and Country: Islamic University of Gaza

Competing Interests: none declared

Thank you for sending this interesting article to me for review. It is an interesting paper that addresses and important strategy and shows a way for effective NMRC implementation.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

The abstract is clearly written.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

The background and methods are also clear and so are the results.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

The discussion and conclusion are logical and make interesting as well as genuine conclusions to the systematic review.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

Some changes that need to be undertaken are mainly linguistic:

page 2, line 7: replace synthesizes with synthesize *** corrected

page 4, line 36: replace decreased with decrease corrected
 page 5, line 44: replace sough with sought corrected
 page 5, line 49: add 'The' at the front of the sentence to: The quality of studies . . . corrected
 page 6, lines 23 and 24: the sentence is muddled up and needs to read: Number of staff interviewed (...) and varied from a maximum of 162 (ref) to a minimum of ten (ref) people. corrected
 Page 6, line 34: delete 'studies' following 'others' corrected
 page 7, line 48: replace performed with perform corrected
 page 8, line 40: replace barrirer with barriers corrected
 page 8, line 45: replace evidenced with evidence corrected
 page 8, line 43: remove 'a' from the phrase: challenge higher level staff corrected
 page 9, line 4: replace manner with manners corrected
 page 9, line 41/42: insert 'a' before time: . . .needing a longer time . . . corrected
 page 10, line 7: replace broach with broad corrected
 page 10 lines 37 and 44: The phrase 'Similarly to what reported in this review . . . ' is not grammatically correct and sounds awkward. Please replace this with another phrase such as 'Similarly to what has been observed in this review . . . ' or 'Similarly to what has been reported in this review . . . ' or 'Similarly to what has been found in this review . . . ' or 'As observed in this review, . . . corrected
 page 10, line 52: replace evidenced with evidence corrected
 page 10, line 54: '.As far as different types of hospitals were concerned . . .' to be replaced for the phrase written in this line. corrected

Conclusion: this is much improved, the focus on the process is useful, as outcomes cannot be confidently determined within this review and I am therefore in agreement with this shift of focus, which makes the paper more interesting and better.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

This is an interesting paper that focuses on review and practical implementation of NMRC. As such it comes to some obvious conclusions that are not surprising. But it is good to have this summarised as a source of reference and for improvement. It is also interesting to bring in the comparison to some of the grey literature and one way to move this topic from grey to peer reviewed journals (coloured?) literature.

Therefore, I support the acceptance with minor revision despite the fact that many points in discussion and conclusion were not surprising or 'new'.

*** Thank you for the appreciation

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Barbara Madaj, Head of Monitoring and Evaluation Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Mar-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Points raised in the previous review have been addressed appropriately, raising the quality of the paper and ensuring it is ready for publication. No additional issues to be addressed, with the exception of a number of typos and grammatical errors which require correcting before the publication (refereced to Word document with track changes): - Consistency: Throughout the paper spacing between references needs to be consilidated, eg. 1,2 or 1, 2; 'African region' or 'African Region'? - p.5 'Knowledge on factors affecting the successful NMCR
-------------------------	--

	<p>implementation can help policy maker (...) - please amend to 'policy makers'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - p.7 'Results of this review will be disseminated to study participants (ie, to authors of the included studies) by its publication' - please remove this sentence altogether - p. 7 'Factors were divided in:' - please change to 'divided into:' - p.11 'In line to...' - please change to 'In line with...' - p.12 '... knowledge of evidence based practices are in common' - please change to 'are common' - p.12 'More research should be conducted for testing...' - please change to 'conducted to test...' - p.16 Font size of reference 30 seems different from other entries - please amend as needed - p.19 Table 2 superfluous '+' in Hamersveld 2012 column Methods and tools - please remove - p.21 Footer under the table 'No enough...' - should read 'Not enough..'; also full stop missing at the end of the line to be added
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editorial Requests:

- Can you please go through and check that you are reporting all items in the PRISMA extension for abstracts? See: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/Abstracts.aspx> For example, the abstract currently does not include the search dates for each database.

We appreciate that the abstract formats vary for systematic reviews published in BMJ Open. We would be grateful if your abstract could follow a similar format to the following paper: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29615407> However, we would be grateful if you could retain the 'background' section as this provides some context to your objective.

*** We have reviewed the abstract s suggested

- We agree with reviewer 1 that the quality of English still needs improving in places before publication. Please see an example below.

Please thoroughly proofread the paper one more time. We recommend consulting a native English speaker, if possible.

*** The paper has been corrected by a native English speaker

Page 4: "...and adds as a new knowledge a list of recommendations, relevant both for researcher and for policy makers, for facilitating effective NMCR implementation in LMIC." Please amend to something like: "...and provides a list of recommendations relevant for both researchers and policy makers for facilitating effective NMCR implementation in LMIC."

*** This has been corrected as suggested

- Please revise your 'patient and public involvement' statement on page 7. The following sentence lacks clarity: "For example, in revising studies, we evaluated whether patient views were considered, the general attitude of service providers toward patients." If patients were not directly involved in the design and conception of this study then please state this.

*** This has been corrected as suggested

Reviewer's Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Barbara Madaj, Head of Monitoring and Evaluation

Institution and Country: Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

Competing Interests: None declared

Points raised in the previous review have been addressed appropriately, raising the quality of the paper and ensuring it is ready for publication. No additional issues to be addressed, with the exception of a number of typos and grammatical errors which require correcting before the publication (refereed to Word document with track changes):

- Consistency: Throughout the paper spacing between references needs to be consolidated, eg. 1,2 or 1, 2; 'African region' or 'African Region'?
- p.5 'Knowledge on factors affecting the successful NMCR implementation can help policy maker (...)' - please amend to 'policy makers'
- p.7 'Results of this review will be disseminated to study participants (ie, to authors of the included studies) by its publication' - please remove this sentence altogether
- p. 7 'Factors were divided in:' - please change to 'divided into:'
- p.11 'In line to...' - please change to 'In line with...'
- p.12 '... knowledge of evidence based practices are in common' - please change to 'are common'
- p.12 'More research should be conducted for testing...' - please change to 'conducted to test...'
- p.16 Font size of reference 30 seems different from other entries - please amend as needed
- p.19 Table 2 superfluous '+' in Hamersveld 2012 column Methods and tools - please remove
- p.21 Footer under the table 'No enough...' - should read 'Not enough..'; also full stop missing at the end of the line to be added

*** These have been corrected as suggested. The paper has been corrected by a native English speaker