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General comments

This purpose of this paper was to conduct a systematic review, with the goal to identify, retrieve, analyze, and assess available generic health literacy measurement instruments for children and adolescents ≤ 18 years old. The authors outlined six properties by which to analyze the health literacy assessment tools, including: a) instrument characteristics; b) participant participation in the development process; c) psychometric properties; d) contextual factors; e) underlying health literacy models; and f) scope of measured components. The methodology described for the systematic review is thorough and provides the information needed to reproduce the search. The findings are presented in a clear way and serve as a reference for scholars/researchers working in the field of adolescent health literacy. I thank you for letting me review the manuscript.

1. In the reviewed manuscripts, were there discussions of outcomes associated with the health literacy assessments? The authors briefly discuss this in terms of validity measures (for example GPA and other health literacy tools), but not in terms of health-related outcomes, such as overall health, wellness visits, emergency room visits, health care utilization, etc. The authors discuss health-related outcomes in the introduction as part of the literature - and it would be useful to know if any of the studies discussed this as well.

2. How did the authors decide on what "properties" to include in their analysis? Was this based on the prior systematic review? Other reviews? Expert input?

3. "Scope of measured components" - this is an important section (page 11) and more information is needed on how the content analysis was performed - was there a codebook developed? Did you use an existing framework to content analyze? Were components (I would suggest renaming as dimensions) all manifest? Or were there some latent? Meaning, did a word have to be present for a dimension to be identified or was there some subjective assessment by authors? I find this to be one of the more interesting sections and I would like to know more on how you developed the coding scheme - this speaks to the multi-dimensional nature of the health literacy construct.

Minor comments

1. Another proofread will help with many of the grammatical errors
2. Some sentences in the discussion section could be omitted or cleaned up (Page 12, lines 7-8, lines 23-25)

3. "In turn" is used quite frequently in the discussion section. Is there a synonym to use?

4. Page 17 lines 37-39 unclear. You may want to consider using the word "dimensions" as opposed to components - this may help readers better understand what you are trying to say, as this term is more widely used when discussing concepts/constructs.

5. In the discussion section, you present your discussion using the six properties framework - the "instrument characteristics" property includes the first few sections of the discussion (objective, age of participants, etc.) and you may want to reorganize/rename or create subheadings to follow more of a parallel structure - I appreciate how you used this framework to present and discuss findings.
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