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Reviewer's report:

The article presents the results of a scoping review on patient and family engagement and is based on the methodology of Akrsey and O'Malley. The manuscript addresses an interesting and emerging topic, on which to our knowledge no systematics review have so far been conducted.

Major compulsory revisions

• The scoping review is based on the methodology such as outlined by Akrsey and O'Malley. Given that well-established systematic review methodologies do exist, especially within the Cochrane collaboration, the authors must provide a good rational why they did not use a standard systematic review method. For example, why did they not rely on Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation Working Group (GRADE) for assessing the quality of the available evidence?

• In the result section subchapter 4, the barriers to patient engagement are nicely outlined in a bullet list. As importantly as the barriers are also the enablers for increased patient and family engagement. In consequence, the scoping review should also add the results of the enablers.

• Not much is said that across the manuscript that one of objectives of increased patient engagement is behavioural change of patients (e.g. within smoking cessation activities or diabetes control). Please extend on this aspect.

• The result section is structure along 7 themes. The authors should strongly consider to restructure the organisation of these themes along: Inputs, Process, Outcome. If this logic is followed, the sub-chapter 6 in the result section on engagement resourcing is to be considered as input to patient and family engagement and should come at the beginning of the result section.

• The discussion section is somehow not well tied to the result section. In other words the discussion section is not used to discuss the 7 themes identified in the results section and the strength and the weaknesses of the results found by the scoping review but rather provides a discussion on topics such tools used for patient engagement. Please align the discussion better to result section thereby eventually used the logic mentioned above (inputs, process outcome for/of patient engagement)

• There is no abstract. This has to be added

Minor compulsory revisions
On page 2 there is the sentence “The actual resource kit, its pilot and evaluation within AHS, are described in other manuscripts.” Either drop this sentence or add the references

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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