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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary revisions

In the original Arksey and O'Malley paper we gave an indication of the size and scope of the study we were undertaking as a guide for researchers working in this area. A similar indication, and more examples, from the study itself would probably help to contextualise the comments made here.

The paper also feels pedantic in some aspects of interpretation of the original study although rightly points out a number of issues that require clarification. it may be helpful if the points raised here could be distinguished between those that are 'clarification' of original points by Arksey and O'Malley or 'additional' steps that ought to be included.
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As one of the authors of the original paper to which this responds I have some interest in the paper. On the whole I think this is a welcome addition to the field, particularly in terms of healthcare.