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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for some careful corrections and clarifications in the paper. However, I still disagree with the authors who claim, that this work is a systematic review according to the international guidelines how to conduct a qualitative systematic review. For classification of reviews please see: https://eahilcpd.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/review-ready-reckoner.pdf

From my point of view this paper miss the aim of a qualitative systematic review due to the following reasons:
1) the chosen research question „involvement…” is too general resulting to
2) not clear defined inclusion criteria of the studies with the consequence of a lack of a comprehensible systematics. 3) The synthesis of the results of the studies with different research questions and different qualitative and quantitative methods is predominantly descriptive and was not performed according a predefined pathway. 4) The used tool to analyse the quality of the studies seems not sufficient to me. However, I think that this is an interesting and well written paper worth to publish, although to my mind as „scoping review”.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal