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Reviewer's report:

Although the Authors made several changes in their manuscript with a thorough Editor help, it seems to me this paper remains a draft, far from being a scoping review (for example, in page 9 AMSTAR is written in different ways; in Table 1 the findings from my cited paper are reported erroneously, i.e. Countries from the RCTs surveyed were reported; and again, still remains unclear who could be interested in this scoping review results).

My main suggestion for writing a scoping review is to avoid listing inconsistent results comparing protocols and published paper, and address the audience possibly interested to the scoping review. If the audience is made by clinicians, you need to address the problem of clinically important inconsistencies for the two major discrepancies, primary outcome changes (downgraded or upgraded) and bias in reporting, and de-emphasize inconsistencies from subgroup analyses or funding.

Again, several claims in the discussion does not guide solution to the problem of discrepancy between protocols and published papers, and repeat only claims previously reported, as in my cited paper.

Which adding information a cloud could give us?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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