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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the invitation to review the study: "Stakeholder involvement in systematic reviews: a scoping review." This scoping review focused on a comprehensive description of different kinds of stakeholder involvement in systematic reviews, considering several variables regarding the systematic review. I found the paper rigorously done, the appendices help to improve the transparency of the research process, and the bibliography is appropriated.

I have only five commentaries

1. In the abstract. The methods section is not clear when explaining the titles screening, specifically when you say: "Titles and abstracts were screened by 1 author, after determining agreement between authors was >95%" In the methods section of the manuscript I understood what you are talking about, but not in the abstract. I think should consider a change of wording here.

2. I found unnecessary to present always the proportions in the format (%, #/N) You can provide only the percentage and clarify your N at the beginning of the paragraph.

3. The search strategy. I was not able to understand why you began with a narrow search (between 2014-2016) and then moved to 2010-2013, but you argue that majority of papers were between 2014-2015. It is possible that if this issue is not clear to me, maybe is not clear for the readers as well.

4. In the selection criteria section, you say: "We excluded titles without abstracts, and review protocols; this was a pragmatic decision made in light of the high volume of search results." I understand the criteria, but you should discuss if this can imply any kind of publication bias in your scoping review.

5. Finally, regarding the focus of the review section. I recommend providing further clarification when you say: 'Most frequently (10%, 29/291) this was 'factors influencing health status and contact with health services', where reviews covered topics such as the effectiveness or implementation of care pathways for specific population (e.g. paediatrics,
geriatrics, emergency care)." I found that a description of the kind of issues focused on those systematic reviews might be interesting for the readers. More than the ICD 10 categories, information about if the focus of the systematic review is for example interventions (e.g., clinical, surgical, public health), a diagnostic test, PROs, strategies of healthcare delivery, educational interventions, risk factor assessment, etc., would be more fruitful.
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