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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this piece of research. This appears to be a rigorous and relevant piece of research that I'm happy to recommend for publication after having been subject to minor revisions.

Comments

− Introduction: Could you perhaps elaborate a bit more on what is known about the implementation of SDM in paediatric care (or in general)? For example, what kind of outcomes has it been associated with? You touch upon this in the discussion, but I think it would be helpful to get more background information earlier on. Further, it would be good if you could briefly address how your review adds to the Wyatt et al 2015 paper.

− Why did you include studies with multiple participants (Table 2: "Citations reporting perceptions for multiple participants"), although this, in case of parents and children, is contrary to your inclusion criteria: "We excluded studies that evaluated both children and adults" (p6, lines 51-53)

− Why did you assess study quality if that did not influence how you subsequently synthesized the studies? For example, would your results remain the same if excluding studies of low quality from your synthesis? This is a voluntary suggestion, but past research have made efforts to investigate how study quality influence the themes identified by a thematic/narrative synthesis (see e.g. appendix C in Rees R, Oliver K, Woodman J, Thomas J (2009) Children's views about obesity, body size, shape and weight: a systematic review; or Bach-Mortensen et al 2018 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0789-7)

− P 5-6, lines 58-6: Did you add the two additional levels (decision and relational) before or during the synthesis process? During my initial reading, I assumed the latter, but on p 8 when you mention "Second, two coders deductively analyzed the content using the OMRU barrier and facilitator levels (decision, innovation, adopter, relational, and environment) and a SDM barrier and facilitator taxonomy [8, 18]", it seems to suggest that it was decided prior to the coding.
Could you perhaps elaborate a bit more on how you came up with the two added levels (decision and relational) and how they fit into and/or change the original OMNU framework?

− P 6, line 36: you mention 'PICOS', but in Table 1, only the population, intervention, comparison, and outcome components are included (thus leaving out the 'study method').

− P 6, lines 53-58: the sentence should read: "These parameters are consistent with previous systematic reviews that examined SDM barriers and facilitators in adult clinical practice".

− Did you identify additional studies by going through the references? If so, how many and were they included in the final synthesis?

− P 15, section 1.3.3: what is meant by "value-neutral barriers and facilitators"?

− P 19, lines 8-11: Here a Cochrane review is cited as reference number [36], which I was not able to identify in the reference list.


− Strengths and limitations: Could you perhaps reflect on why you decided to include certain types of participants, but not others such as grandparents, step-parents, or siblings? Please also discuss how the quality and identified sources of bias of included studies might have influenced your findings.

− Table 2: More detail about the participants would be helpful. For example, would it be possible to report on the age-group of children and perhaps distinguish between 'children' and 'adolescents', as well as 'nurses' and 'medical doctors', and 'single parents', 'couples' and 'step parents'?

− Table 3: Some text is missing in the 'mixed methods' row 1. Also, there's a typo at the legend of the table: "unsur".
Figure 3: Some of the arrows need graphic editing and there's a typo that should read 'uncomfortable decisions'. Also, could you perhaps add some text in the manuscript on how the figure helps explain why the included elements are interrelated? For example, are some factors more influential than others?

Supplementary file 1: Is it correct that this search only applies to the CINAHL database? If so, could you please rephrase the reference to the appendix, so it's clear that it's a sample of the full search?

PRISMA checklist: I suspect the attached version may apply to an earlier draft of the manuscript.
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