

Reviewer's report

Title: Use of communities of practice in business and health care sectors: A systematic review

Version: 2 Date: 3 March 2009

Reviewer: Henry Anaya

Reviewer's report:

I don't think that the following sentence addressing my original apprehension as to the age of the data is strong enough:

"Another limitation was that we included publications between 1991 and 2005. Due to the complexity of the data extraction and synthesis, the study took longer than expected. Nonetheless, the in-depth analysis of this study contributes to the understanding about how the CoP concept is changed and operationalized over the years."

It is true that your study "contributes to the understanding" of CoP. What is not expressed is that the lag between your final data collection period and today (4+ years) in all likelihood has missed important new findings that could inform the field. Therefore, your paper is not as comprehensive as could (or should) be. This is a serious limitation and although you may not have the inclination at this late date for a reanalysis with refreshed data, this problem should not be minimized by stating that this work "contributes to the understanding". It does, but there is a big (4 year) gap in knowledge which needs to be elucidated more clearly as a serious limitation.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests