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Reviewer's report:

I had the opportunity to review the article titled: "knowledge and information of young people with epilepsy and their parents: mixed methods systematic review". Overall I think that the review is very useful but needs to be summarized better, the review is too long and it is difficult to read. I have the following comments:

1) The introduction is too long. For example I understand that some concepts such as comorbidity and disability are important in patients with epilepsy that are in the transition between childhood and adolescence but the sentences about these aspects can be shortened.

2) Regarding methods, I think the authors have to precise better how the extraction of information was done. Were two people extracting the information?, then a group discussed the information? the final report was a consensus?. All these aspects are important in a systematic review.

3) Again the report of results is very complex. Is there any way that the main observations can be summarized?. The current section of results is hard to read and the sentence just below every proposition makes confusing the article.

4) The discussion is long. Probably the most important observation could be discussed.

5) If the extraction of the information is in the tables, then the section of results discussion should be shortened and focus in the main findings.

6) It is possible that the authors can create a table of recommendations according their review in order to have a successful transition between a childhood and an adult epilepsy clinic. I think could be one of the most important tables in the article after the comprehensive review.

7) The review is very helpful and deserves publication. The current version is very long and does not necessarily accomplish the objective of a systematic review. I suggest some changes before potential publication.
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