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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is very well written, and it also deals with a relevant topic. In spite of these, I do have some reservations.

1. The topic is fluid; there are numerous publications on researcher-policymaker relationship using concepts which are very similar. This is especially an issue when authors (or reviewers!) of these papers come from different language backgrounds and are thus not fully aware of the slight nuances of the words.

2. This manuscript suggests a term of ‘engagement practices’ - and finds out that none of the included papers used the term. Already this is an alarm.

3. The aim is to cover co-creation and use of research; the latter is a very wide concept and consists of a much larger literature (e.g. on facilitators of use of research) than included here.

4. The way the inclusion criteria have been defined, is not fully logic compared to what has been included in the review. E.g. Table 1 mentions 'interventions', which seem to include many other descriptions than actual interventions. Actually, reviewing potential interventions to increase cocreation (or use of research) would be much clearer aim and also more relevant aim of a review.

5. Further, it is said that projects without long-term collaboration have been excluded; however, the length needed is not explicitly mentioned- and interventions are mostly funded projects…

6. It is no wonder that the scoping review results are very similar with studies using slightly different terminology. This also shows that to start with, creating new terms guiding scoping review yields not so specific results. I mention this, knowing that scoping review is not supposed to be specific.

7. I acknowledge that the present review includes papers until 2017. However, it looks that the discussion e.g. has no references from 2019 even if there are relevant papers on the topic.
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