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What do we know about who does and does not attend general health checks? Findings from a narrative scoping review

Dear Editor,

We have taken your comments on board and amended our paper to clarify the methodology used.

We have re-examined our paper and believe that our description of the type of review we conducted was somewhat ambiguous. In the original paper we described the review as employing systematic review procedures. This was intended to describe the thoroughness of the search strategy rather than indicating that the review was a full systematic review (as defined by Cochrane). We acknowledge the usefulness of the PRISMA structure for reporting systematic reviews and agree that this would be the most appropriate format for reporting a full systematic review.

However, our paper was in fact a scoping review with a narrative synthesis of the findings, as outlined by Arksey and O’Malley. The scoping review process was conducted systematically and the methodology is clearly outlined and supported by tables and the flow chart. We did use the term scoping review in the original paper but believe that our use of the term “systematic” in relation to the search strategy confused the matter somewhat. We apologise for this.

Given the scoping review form we believe that the PRISMA template would be misleading and not fit the process that we adopted and that needed to reflect a scoping review. We believe that there have been a number of other similar types of review published in BMC Public Health recently and we have attempted to follow these in style. We have therefore amended the manuscript to address these points and hope that this is acceptable.

Thank you,

Ruth Dryden (PhD student) and Prof Brian Williams