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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMMENTS

1. It would be preferable if the review protocol could be made available (e.g. as an electronic/additional file?)

2. Overview of existing systematic reviews – the authors only discuss 3 of the 8 included review. I think it is essential to clearly state in this section that 8 reviews were identified. It may well be appropriate to just to describe 3 – but as a reader I need to know why this decision has been made and why you are not discussing the remaining 5.

3. Results of search.

“142 met the eligibility criteria and were included. Studies reported a spectrum of engagement. Studies described patient engagement in research preparation phase (24), execution phase (64) and translation phase (21).”

Could the types of studies be described in relation to the total number of included studies (i.e. 142). The list above only adds up to 109, so I don’t know about the remaining 33. I realise that there will be a reason for these 33 not being included in the list of ‘phases’ (e.g. some of the 33 will be systematic reviews etc)….but it would be nice if all of this could “add up” so that the reader gets a complete picture of the study results.

[Figure 2 is a great addition to this paper – ideal!]

MINOR COMMENTS

4. Discussion. Is the heading “comparisons with other systematic reviews” in the right place? It seems to relate to the paragraph below.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

5. Supplemental table 2: systematic reviews. It would be helpful to add a column detailing the aims of the review.
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