Reviewer’s report

Title: Trust in Group Decisions: A Scoping Review

Version: 0 Date: 26 Feb 2019

Reviewer: Daniel J. Schumacher

Reviewer's report:

Intro: For me, the discussion of all of the different ways that trust can be viewed gets a little confusing, and I say this as someone who has studied trust, entrustment, and CCCs. I might lay out the various ways that trust can be considered all in one list in 1-2 sentences early in the introduction before getting into a more detailed discussion of any one of these. I believe this would help with the clarity of where the introduction and paper are going. This stated, I am not sure that I would go into some of the detail about the types of trust that is the focus of this paper. This paper focuses on group trust. Your introduction discusses types of trust that are beyond that.

Intro, theoretical framework: I am not convinced that you needed a theoretical framework in the manner in which you used it in this paper. One could argue that the literature review you conduct would/should elicit the parts of a theory for what you are interested in. You elude to this in your final few sentences of this section where you reference your results and proposed model. With this in mind, I think that the content of this section is OK. However, I wonder if this is better positioned in the methods section (in the early part of this section). This would also keep the intro shorter and more focused and help to correct some of the clarity issues that exist in the intro currently.

Page 8, lines 16-17: Why did you exclude articles from computer science, IT, and economics?

Page 8, lines 28-36: I believe that this description of what you sought to do is much clearer and more succinct than what is provided in the introduction section. I would recommend moving this to the intro and ending the intro with this content.

Results: I believe that the findings of this study make a meaningful contribution to the literature. This paper will be very helpful as now multiple countries are seeking to structure and refine competency committees. The individual, group, and environmental factors sections are interesting and seem to be of high utility for consideration.

Discussion, Limitations, and Conclusion: These are all well-written and appropriate.
Figures and Tables: These all are clear and support the results and discussion sections well. Table 2, Table 3, and Figure 3 are especially helpful.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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**
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