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Reviewer’s report:

The authors detail a carefully constructed and very thorough protocol to achieve their study aim of performing a narrative synthesis of what is known about discharge instructions for caregivers of children in emergency departments (what works and why). Their approach is systematic, clear and relevant to the research question. Furthermore, they are taking great pains to include relevant stakeholders (including caregivers), methodological experts and content experts to ensure their protocol continues to evolve in a productive direction. They are using multiple valuable review strategies simultaneously.

While the authors will appropriately take into account gray literature and local policies from Canada and related health systems, I am unsure how much peer-reviewed literature they will find on the topic. A general question I have is whether the authors are concerned that their synthesis may become overwhelmed by methodologically non-rigorous work rather than strong evidence? I believe they will be able to transparently address this, and future readers will not be deceived -- and I agree with the authors that this review is a necessary first step in moving this field forward; but I wonder if they are concerned that the final recommendations coming from this work could be founded on weak or anecdotal evidence.

Major Compulsory Revisions: none. See general question above.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Can the authors clarify what they mean by a "scoping review"? (Methods paragraph 3)
2. Will the authors exclude observational study designs? It wasn't clear to me -- Methods Section Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria suggests that "interventions and/or processes relate to discharge instruction in an ED must be stated as the primary objective of the study". Would excluding observational studies unduly limit the potential research findings, especially given a potentially small overall body of literature?
3. "rational" should be "rationale"
4. References 1, 24, 26 do not appear complete
5. Methods: Quality Appraisal of relevant studies: Can the authors describe in slightly more detail how the quality criteria will be scored or summarized?
Discretionary Revisions: none

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests