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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for this revised version of the manuscript. Authors have correctly considered all the points raised during the previous peer review. Nevertheless, I would encourage authors to consider the following minor comments:

Abstract.

Methods.

Page 2. Line 62. "(…) (including thesis)" should be deleted.

Page 2. Line 65. "Two reviewers will double check studies eligibility and data relevance" should be replaced by "Two reviewers will independently screen, select, and extract data".

Introduction.

Page 5. Line 123. Usage of abbreviations. Where "The purpose of PPTs is (…)" should be "The purpose of Patient Prioritization Tools is (PPTs)…". In addition, please, be consistent through the paper (e.g. page 12, lines 284, 287, etc…)

Methods.

Page 9. Line 210. Preliminary results should be deleted. Therefore, the statement "We anticipate to find potentially 10 000 records in all these databases" should be omitted/deleted. In addition, please delete results from Appendix Table 1 "column Results".

Page 9 Lines 219-2020. Eligibility criteria. The authors state they will consider "peer-reviewed quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods empirical studies (which includes all qualitative research and methods and qualitative research designs).

I think there is a type here "all qualitative research and methods and qualitative research designs". Please, clarify. What about "quantitative study designs"? Please, be more explicit and
clarify eligible study designs (such as randomized controlled studies, cohort studies, case-control, cross-sectional, etc…).

Page 9 Line 220. Please delete (…) "and thesis". If you will consider thesis dissertations, please include a new phrase/statement, and provide description of information sources (e.g. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database, Google Scholar) in subsection "Information sources"?

Page 11. Critical appraisal. Please, describe bias/quality assessment for quantitative study designs (e.g. Cochrane risk of bias tool for experimental studies/randomized controlled trials and Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational studies) and provide references. Otherwise, clarify.
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