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GENERAL
Published protocol on Open Science Framework. Follows PRISMA extention for scoping reviews.
Consider information provided by the european program EUPATI regarding patient involvement (www.eupati.eu/). Consider also information provided by James Lind Alliance (www.jla.nihr.ac.uk) and by HTAi interest group Patients and Citizen Involvement (https://htai.org/interest-groups/pcig/).

ABSTRACT
Omit reference in abstract, indicate in Background instead. The Abstract indicates Arksey and O' Malley (2005), but the Methods section indicates Colquhoun (2014), regarding scoping review methods.

Title
Include in title (and Background) information about in what domain of patient engagement/involvement this scoping review covers (e.g. patient involvement in research priority settings, in clinical trials, in HTA production, in dissemination/communication, in healthcare decision-making).

Background
Include information about in what domain of "patient engagement/involvement" this scoping review covers (e.g. patient involvement in research priority settings, in clinical trials, in HTA production, in dissemination/communication, in healthcare decision-making). List and refer to existing systematic reviews or reports that have covered similar or adjacent topics.

METHODS

Protocol and research question
The information under this heading is better placed under Background.
Place "4) quality assessment" after "3) study selection". Omit " In addition, as some researchers [23, 24] argue the importance of conducting a quality assessment, a quality assessment of included studies was included". Formulate here the research question in a PICO-format.

Information sources and search strategy
Put first two sentences "Co-investigators were given information… energy to an endeavor" under the section "Co-design and co-investigators" instead.
Indicate if a librarian /information specialist was consulted regarding the search strategy.

Eligibility criteria
Unclear.
Place L158 "All search results were merged...letters to the editor." L167 under Eligibility criteria.

Study identification
Put Place L158 "All search results were merged...letters to the editor." L167 under Eligibility criteria.
Start Study Identification section with L169 "The first 1700 titles…"

Quality Assessment
Move section on quality assessment to before the section "Data extraction (charting)".

Data extraction (charting)
Provide Data extraction checklist worksheet in Appendix.
Describe how items (study characteristics) were selected (identification of relevant data to extract) and calibrated among team members.
Consider data extraction recommendations provided in Trocci et al 2018 PRISMA-ScR.

Data synthesis
Indicate how data was synthesized.

RESULTS

Figure 1 was not provided in the uploaded manuscript.

Study characteristics
Provide more information besides country and study design type.
Provide information regarding study design also in Table 1 (i.e. quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods).

Table 1
Omit bullets in table.
Provide information regarding study design in Table 1 (quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods).
Include description of "Themes" in the table (e.g. as subheadings).
Include concise statement regarding outcomes and results of each included study. Consider including a categorization of the domain/ focus of study, e.g. HTA/SR, qualitative research, outcomes research, patient safety, teaching/education, research priority setting.

Table 2
Include information on study theme also in table 2.

Quality assessment
Unclear regarding the 4 studies that were not quality assessed, in what way they were included in the review.

Study themes
Needs further clarification.

Study outcomes
Include concise statement regarding outcomes and results of each included studies in Table 1.

DISCUSSION
Consider information provided by the European program EUPATI regarding patient involvement (www.eupati.eu/). Consider also information provided by James Lind Alliance (www.jla.nihr.ac.uk) and by HTAi interest group Patients and Citizen Involvement (https://htai.org/interest-groups/pcig/).
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