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Reviewer's report:

In terms of response to earlier concerns I am convinced that this scoping review provides a current view of what is available compared to the context of decades-old studies that are in the literature. The balance of this in my opinion outweighs an evaluation of the quality of databases referred to.

However I am becoming more and more uncomfortable with the statement:

“We did not formally assess the usability of these databases or the quality of the information contained within them, as this exceeded the scope of this scoping review. Despite this, it should be noted that initial impressions obtained simply by completing the data extraction step for this review indicated that these databases vary largely in both quality and how frequently they are updated."

Frequency of update I concede is an issue. But subjective labeling is going to be fraught with issues. The evaluation of quality could therefore also vary between this study or from within other contexts where different criteria are used.

So either there must be no mention as to the quality, or the quality must be referenced in terms of objective criteria. To me the former is prudent in the context of this scoping study.

Perhaps one can alert the reader to the frequency of update of the databases, which is not subjective under any circumstance.

If this is cleared up, I feel that not only is this scoping review relevant with respect to CAM but also with respect to being overdue in the literature.
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