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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper addresses the topic of medical tourism, which is a subject of increasing interest. The paper is clearly written.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The scoping process seems not so different from a systematic review at some points. The authors state that a main difference is the development of criteria to include or exclude articles. In scoping reviews this is done post hoc. The team identified bases for exclusion of articles, all based on the focus of the article. Although I can understand that these criteria were developed post hoc, I do not understand why there are no quality criteria. For systematic reviews quality of the studies included is important and it is obvious that this is also important in scoping reviews.

The scoping review includes different countries. However, the authors do not mention differences in rules and regulations for medical tourism or cross-border health care. In July 2008, the European Commission (EC) adopted a proposal concerning patients' rights in cross-border health care. Aim of this proposal is to make clear who is responsible for quality and safe health care in cross-border settings. Furthermore, it underlines the importance of providing transparent information to make people aware of their rights and opportunities. Desired and expected impact is to achieve enhanced patient mobility and to realise effective cooperation and better sharing capacities between different European countries. Health insurers in European countries can contract health care providers in other countries. This is only an example of relevant information in an article on this topic and similar information should be provided for the US and Canada. More information on the context is necessary to understand the results.

On page 7 the authors state that the rationale for choosing only Canada for their media search was that the identified sources would likely replicate media coverage of the patient's experience of medical tourism in other countries. This can be questioned as rules and regulations differ. The authors should provide more information to describe to what extent their statement would be true, and where results can not be generalized.

**Minor essential revisions**

The conclusions section is quite long. A lot of information is repeated again. This section should be reduced to one or two paragraphs.
Page 6. Eight types of rationale were identified for the why category. What were the types?

Page 8. The authors state that the level of agreement between authors was high. What is the inter-rater reliability?
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