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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting protocol on an important topic. The design of this review is overall well done. I've listed my recommendations for each section below. The manuscript needs a good look from a copy editor before publication. There are issues with sentence structure, word choice, and verb tense in all sections of the manuscript.

Abstract
- The opening sentence of the Methods section is vague. What is 'their effects' referring to - the DAs, or the elements of SDM And, their effects on what?

Background
- Line 88, you say only chronic conditions. I would specify here that you are going to limit this review to certain chronic conditions.
- What is meant by the 'process of SDM' - clarification or a bit more detail on this could be helpful.
- I'd go into more detail here about why you chose only certain chronic conditions, why will it be more feasible to complete this review by only focusing on three conditions (especially since there are several sub-illnesses for each condition).

Methods
- Under 'Type of studies', you don't include that the DAs have to be for a chronic condition, I'd add this here.
- Under 'Type of studies' will there be a limit to the study setting or time frame?
- Under 'Type of outcome measures', the first sentence says "SDM … will be extracted", even with the parentheses for clarity, I would give this more detail. What about SDM will be extracted?

- Under 'Information sources and search strategy', I do not see the time specifications of your search, e.g., "from inception through October 2016"

- Line 148, you say 'if possible' - what scenario would make it not possible to give the total number of results per database? This is usually manageable.

- Line 150 - 152 - what is meant by 'ensure comprehension of the eligibility criteria?'

- Line 152 - I'd provide a bit more clarity to the phrase "independently and in duplicate" - will there be two phases, first independent and then duplicate, or will duplicate review happen only in certain instances?

- I'm confused about the management of duplicated articles. First, it seems fine to include only aggregate results after deduplication, rather than trying to list them out by database. Also, at line 157 you say duplicate eligible articles will all be included in the abstract screening phase. Why would duplicate articles be included at this point? If they are the same article, you should only have to extract data from one, correct? Do you mean duplicate studies but different articles?

- For 'Data collection process' - I would state in the first sentence that the two reviewers will complete their data collection independently. On line 181-182 you say "independently and in duplicate" - again I would clarify when the work will be independent and when it will be duplicate.

- Again, for the outcomes section, measurement of the effects on the process of SDM is not well explained. Overall, I'd suggest providing more detail on this outcome throughout the manuscript.

- For the outcomes, will you look at specific clinical and patient important outcomes or just any that appear in the included studies?

- Is there a plan for comparison if the same DA is used in two different studies?

- Will a meta-analysis be completed? If not, what is the rationale?
- There are grammatical errors throughout the methods section that could be resolved with a good copy edit.

Discussion

- A copy edit is needed for this section as well.

- Most of the discussion is taken up by the potential limitations. I'd add additional detail about the potential results and outcomes of this review.

Minor editing comments

- You use the phrase 'so-called' a couple of times. I think all instances can be removed to strengthen the sentences they are used in.

- You vary your use of the oxford comma. I would either use it or not use it.

- A comma is needed after all instances of "i.e." and "e.g." - "i.e.," or "e.g.,"

- I believe EBSCO and CINAHL should be all caps
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