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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,

This is my first review for Biomed Central. According to your article types, you claim that the journal does not generally consider narrative review articles. This article may fall into this category and therefore might not be appropriate. However, because it is data-based, I will provide my comments. (Overall accept for publication with only discretionary revisions advised.)

1 Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question posed is clear and straight forward. However, without reading the specific 33 articles from which this review is derived, it would seem difficult to ascertain clear answers to their question because varying methodologies would have been used across studies. It makes sense that they were only able to find 33 articles out of thousands to glean information.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The authors provide a comprehensive accounting of their search strategy, inclusion criteria and what role each author played in the review.

3. Are the data sound?
The data is sound despite what is thinly available from the studies. The results confirm what might be considered obvious. However, the review provides a contribution because it consolidates the evidence needed to make clinical and service planning judgments.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The manuscript is set out and organized to make for easy reading. It conforms with conventional reporting standards.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion and conclusions are balanced and supported by the data. In addition, the authors propose and debate several strategies that might improve
consumer engagement in health checks. I was wishing for a deeper discussion and development of their ideas because I found them interesting.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The authors identify limitations pertaining to their search strategy. They do not however discuss how they could have enlarged their review pool by expanding the inclusion criteria.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
The authors draw and cite a great deal of relevant published work and policies to inform their work.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
A well written manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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