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Reviewer's report:

I found this to be a well-conducted and well-written, readable scoping review. The goal and methods are appropriate and clearly stated. The table provided is useful.

I am not familiar with Levac et al’s scoping review framework but it might be helpful to review the PRISMA criteria http://www.prisma-statement.org for systematic reviews to see whether there are relevant criteria that also apply. There is nothing glaringly absent – I imagine that the PRISMA criteria related to the search strategy would be applicable, but probably not the analysis portion. PRISMA requires submission of a standardized flow diagram, which may be helpful here.

The last paragraph in the Background section would benefit from a better transition preceding it, perhaps indicating that there has been a paucity of research and perhaps a gap until recently, or are these papers mentioned because they led to the scoping exercise? It might help to just clarify a bit more here.

The Routine Prenatal, Routine Antenatal, and Sensitizing Events format works well.

Some elements that bear further discussion include: what data exist around what constitutes a sensitizing event. This is provided to a limited degree in a dedicated section called Potential Sensitizing Events that refers to an additional file. However, further discussion about how various interpretations of what constitutes a sensitizing event and what data exist to inform these interpretations is important since these interpretations fundamentally impact performance rates with anti-D immunoglobulin administration. The very little data that exists on this topic are somewhat conflicting and on my prior review did not present a clear picture. Further, whether to administer in the first trimester in the context of a sensitizing event is another area of considerable variability that should be discussed as this is relevant to performance rates.

Limitations are appropriately stated.
Authors acknowledge work appropriately.
Title and abstract appear appropriate.
Writing is clear and thoughtful.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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