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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review this important paper that employed a scoping review methodology to systematically examine the literature describing public involvement in initiatives to reduce low-value care. The authors are to be congratulated for the robust methodology used, including following PRESS and PRISMA principles, and comprehensive reporting. The paper offers a cogent and important overview of key papers in the field (notwithstanding comments below). Overall the paper is excellent but I do have one substantive comment relating to the method that I suspect other readers may agree with and so feel it is important that the authors consider examining and commenting on, perhaps in the limitations section.

Major substantive comment:

Overall I congratulate the authors on the search terms used in this scoping review. As evidenced in the paper "De-adoption and its 43 related terms: harmonizing low-value care terminology" there is terminological proliferation in this field and you have done well to capture it. It is not surprising to me that you have identified papers principally within the doctor:patient interaction, and fewer in the policy and research environments. However, I believe this may be due to the exclusion of the words "priority setting" in your terms. I see a basic face validity problem with an almost complete absence of papers by the likes of Julia Abelson among other luminaries in the field of participatory engagement in priority setting (low-value care, I suggest, is a subject within). I concede that including "priority setting" would have blown up your sensitivity and meant much more work searching for needles in a larger haystack, but I suspect some key papers of relevance have been missed as a result.

I do not see this as a critical limitation to the paper, rather one that I encourage you to consider, explore, perhaps disagree with, but nevertheless address in your paper. I may be wrong but suspect a broader readership may feel similarly.

Minor points:

Background

Line 72: "...and upwards of 600 'Do Not Do' recommendations have been produced through the Choosing Wisely campaign[8]." Ref 8 is almost 8 years old and CW now operates in over 2 dozen countries so 000s of recommendations have been produced. Suggest modifying upwards this estimate and updating ref to something recent - Wendy Levinson's writings likely contain some contemporary estimates.

Line 73: "...the National Institute for Clinical Evidence (NICE)"

NICE stands for The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
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