

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)	How people fit in at work: A systematic review of the association between person-organisation and person-group fit with staff outcomes in healthcare
AUTHORS	Herkes, Jessica; Churruca, Kate; Ellis, Louise A.; Pomare, Chiara; Braithwaite, Jeffrey

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Guohong Li Shanghai JiaoTong University, China
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Oct-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The interaction between person and environment (organization and group) is particularly relevant in healthcare settings. The manuscript design a systematic review to identify relevant literature to identify and synthesise knowledge on both person-organisation (P-O) and person-group (P-G) fit in healthcare to determine their association with staff outcomes is very meaningful.</p> <p>It would be better if the author could answer the following questions,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The inclusion criteria should be more clear, especially from records screened (n=300) to records excluded(n=223).2. The definition of "FIT" may be different in different articles, especially in qualitative analysis articles, which may have an impact on the classification of articles. Please add a description to this section.3. Whether person-organisation (P-O) fit and person-group (P-G) fit may have different effects?
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Cécile Boot Amsterdam UMC, VU University, Amsterdam Public Health research institute, the Netherlands
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Nov-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	General
-------------------------	---------

- Aim cannot be reached with the data; 'the extent to' refers to an evaluation of effect sizes, and not simply the presence of a significant association.
- The conclusion is not supported by the data, as improvement in staff outcomes can only be established through longitudinal research. As also cross sectional studies were included, the only research question that can be answered is the question about the presence of an association between fit and outcomes. And not about an increase/improvement in outcomes.
- Methods section is missing important details about the review procedure and quality assessment

Caption 'strenght and limitations'

- is not about strength and limitations, but rather on main implications
- Limitations are missing
- Why is the focus on healthcare important for this topic? What is the added value? There are more settings where a third person is involved (e.g., students, clients, etc.)

Introduction

- The choice for focus on the healthcare setting is not very convincing (yet), see remark above.
- The aim is quantitatively, 'the extent to which' implies an effectsize, whereas this review aims to give insight into the presences of associations between fit and outcome or not. This should be reflected in the formulation of the aim.

Methods

- The search was conducted in April 2017, an update seems of added value, in particular given the increasing attention for research on fit.
- A clear description of inclusion and exclusion criteria is missing
- How many persons were involved in the search/selection process? Please give more information about the search protocol (see also Prisma statement; the authors refer to this, but have not included all items of the checklist in this manuscript.
- Please give more information about the sources of bias, as it is not clear which list was used, and how the items were operationalised. Also: how many researchers assessed the risk of bias? Given the large variety in included designs (from qualitative to quantitative, from cross sectional to longitudinal), this is a very important aspect of the review methodology

Results

- The information about 2 reviewers reviewing 5% should be in the methods section.
- To my opinion, 5% double screening is not a lot, which is also reflected in the kappa op 0.84.
- Where there no qualitative studies included? How is this possible? Please give more information about the in- and exclusion criteria, as these may have caused exclusion of relevant manuscript including qualitative research

Discussion

- Most important issue here: the articles included (ie. Cross sectional studies) cannot give information about improvements in outcomes, as these were only measured once.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

<p>Reviewers' Comments to Author:</p> <p>Reviewer: 1 Reviewer Name: Guohong Li Institution and Country: Shanghai JiaoTong University, China Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared</p> <p>The interaction between person and environment (organization and group) is particularly relevant in healthcare settings. The manuscript design a systematic review to identify relevant literature to identify and synthesise knowledge on both person-organisation (P-O) and person-group (P-G) fit in healthcare to determine their association with staff outcomes is very meaningful.</p>	<p>Thank you for your encouragement of the manuscript.</p>
<p>It would be better if the author could answer the following questions,</p> <p>1. The inclusion criteria should be more clear, especially from records screened (n=300) to records excluded(n=223).</p>	<p>The wording has been altered to make it clearer that “screening” refers to the abstract review stage. Based on your advice and that of the editor, we have also made our inclusion criteria clearer.</p>
<p>2. The definition of “FIT” may be different in different articles, especially in qualitative analysis articles, which may have an impact on the classification of articles. Please add a description to this section.</p>	<p>This is a good point, and one we have addressed in the edited results and discussion.</p>
<p>3. Whether person-organisation (P-O) fit and person-group (P-G) fit may have different effects?</p>	<p>This point is touched upon in the discussion, but we have now introduced it in the introduction.</p>
<p>Reviewer: 2 Reviewer Name: Cécile Boot Institution and Country: Amsterdam UMC, VU University, Amsterdam Public Health research institute, the Netherlands Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared</p> <p>Review BMJ open General - Aim cannot be reached with the data; ‘the extent to’ refers to an evaluation of effect sizes, and not simply the presence of a significant association.</p>	<p>A good point. The wording of the aim has been altered to no longer include the phrase “the extent to”.</p>
<p>- The conclusion is not supported by the data, as improvement in staff outcomes can only be established through longitudinal research. As also cross sectional studies were included, the only research question that can be answered is the question about the presence of an association between fit and outcomes. And not about an increase/improvement in outcomes.</p>	<p>We have tweaked the wording to be more specific that there is an association between fit and staff outcomes, not that there is an increase/improvement in outcomes. Thank you for allowing us to make this clearer.</p>

- Methods section is missing important details about the review procedure and quality assessment	This has been altered to be more detailed and specific.
<p>Caption 'strenght and limitations'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is not about strength and limitations, but rather on main implications - Limitations are missing - Why is the focus on healthcare important for this topic? <p>What is the added value? There are more settings where a third person is involved (e.g., students, clients, etc.)</p>	Limitations have been added, and there has been a point added specific to healthcare.
<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The choice for focus on the healthcare setting is not very convincing (yet), see remark above. 	We have refined our argument about the importance of understanding culture (and therefore fit) particularly in healthcare contexts by some cutting and a few additions in the introduction, which also follows the Editor's suggestion.
- The aim is quantitatively, ' the extent to which' implies an effectsize, whereas this review aims to give insight into the presences of associations between fit and outcome or not. This should be reflected in the formulation of the aim.	The wording of the aim has been altered to reflect this.
<p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The search was conducted in April 2017, an update seems of added value, in particular given the increasing attention for research on fit. 	Thank you, the search has been updated to include articles published up until the end of 2018.
- A clear description of inclusion and exclusion criteria is missing	This has been added.
- How many persons were involved in the search/selection process? Please give more information about the search protocol (see also Prisma statement; the authors refer to this, but have not included all items of the checklist in this manuscript.	Thank you, this has been added to the method section. The methods have been updated in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines.
- Please give more information about the sources of bias, as it is not clear which list was used, and how the items were operationalised. Also: how many researchers assessed the risk of bias? Given the large variety in included designs (from qualitative to quantitative, from cross sectional to longitudinal), this is a very important aspect of the review methodology	This has now been added to the methods section with an example for clarity.
<p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information about 2 reviewers reviewing 5% should be in the methods section. 	Thank you for pointing this out. It has been added to the methods section and only the Kappa has been reported in the results section.
- To my opinion, 5% double screening is not a lot, which is also reflected in the kappa op 0.84.	Thank you for pointing this out. The team has discussed and decided to increase the double screening to 10%, due to the small number of articles.
- Where there no qualitative studies included? How is this possible? Please give more information about the in- and	We have included a more explicit mention of the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study. From this,

<p>exclusion criteria, as these may have caused exclusion of relevant manuscript including qualitative research</p>	<p>it is clearer that qualitative studies were not excluded. Rather, there is a dearth of qualitative studies in this area. The qualitative studies that the authors have found in the area of fit were not conducted in health care settings, and were therefore excluded on those grounds from this review.</p>
<p>Discussion - Most important issue here: the articles included (ie. Cross sectional studies) cannot give information about improvements in outcomes, as these were only measured once.</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. The language has been altered in the discussion.</p>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Guohong Li Shanghai JiaoTong University, School of Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	The revision of the article is acceptable.
-------------------------	--