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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a really interesting paper and it is good to see these ideas presented in such a coherent and concise way. It is clear that systematic reviews are evolving in a number of ways and this thinking around Evidence Ecosystems is welcome. I wondered if the concept of the ecosystem could not be made a little clearer. For instance- how is it different to what others refer to as context? While I am not a fan of things being defined by what they are not, this may be helpful here.

Also, I wondered about the idea that the knowledge producers (reviewers) seem to be being thought of as a unitary group. I would suggest that this is far from the case and that review teams vary greatly, often to good effect and are more than a tokenistic advisory group that meets once or twice in the process. Perhaps a note to this effect and how it chimes with the overarching ideas presented here would be helpful.
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