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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? I do not understand the term 'scoping review'. Why is this not simply a review of the literature relating to management of PSEs in RhD negative women?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes

3. Are the data sound? Probably

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation? yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? I don't understand this question

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? The discussion is too long and repetitive. Might be better to tabulate the studies and what they show.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building both published and unpublished?

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No

10. Is the writing acceptable? No, there are several spelling mistakes and the language could be shortened in several places. In several places the writing does not make sense, eg. page 8 lines 165-167.

Specific comments: the usual abbreviation is HDFN (haemolytic disease of the fetus and newborn). Rh in this context should specify RhD throughout the manuscript. Line 2 of background, should be woman, not women.

The cited reference for data on the incidence of Rh alloimmunisation rate in line 47 of page 3 is more than 10 years old (2002). Are there no more recent data?

Line 85 page 5 should be '...criteria....were', not 'was'.

Potential sensitising events: the first sentence is poorly worded and should be revised.

The reviewed guidelines should include the BCSH guidelines from the UK published in Jan 2014 and not only the NICE guidance. These two do not always concur.

Page 8 line 172 -'The review found..' which review is referred to here?