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Dear editor

We have read with great interest the paper entitled “Efficacy of the Use of the Calgary Family Intervention Model in Bedside Nursing Education: A Systematic Review” by Milesky et al. 1 Authors of this systematic review followed the Kruse Protocol for conducting a systematic review and reported results by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA). 2 The goal of this review was to objectively analyze the research for empirical evidence of the efficacy of the use of the Calgary Family Intervention Model (CFIM) in assisting bedside education by nurses and to identify facilitators and barriers to the use of the Model. 1

However, two points need to be mentioned for the readers.

This protocol has not been listed in a prospectively listed international systematic review database. It is recommended that the protocol be registered in the PROSPERO database for peer review and to reduce unnecessary duplication of efforts among researchers. If a review protocol has been registered, it must be indicated where it can be accessed by providing a registration number and website address or using someone else’s protocol. 3 PROSPERO is an international database of prospectively registered systematic reviews in the health and social fields. 4 The main features of the review protocol are recorded and maintained as permanent records. Systematic reviews should be enrolled early (that is, at the protocol stage) to help avoid unplanned duplication and to allow comparison of the review methods reported with those planned in the protocol. 5

At the article selection process stage, there are difficulties for readers to understand the PRISMA diagram shown. At the screening stage, the reasons for releasing 106 articles from 135 articles have not been explained. Meanwhile, in this section, there is also a selection based on full text, which has a different section from the selection process above. The author needs to explain this so that the screening carried out guarantees the selected articles according to standards.
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