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Reviewer's report:

I have provided identical comments to both Author and Editor.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript, which presents a protocol for a scoping review addressing the subject of sedentary behaviour in hospitalized older adults. For the reasons detailed below, I recommend resubmission with major revision.

The authors appropriately frame the clinical and scientific relevance of their topic. Their methodology is clear, feasible, and makes use of accepted rubrics (JBI & PRISMA). Throughout, the manuscript is clearly written.

To lead to a review that will be suitable for publication, I feel that the protocol needs to be more clearly focused.

As written, it proposes to examine the following aspects of SB: epidemiology, assessment, interventions, and the experiences of stakeholders. Any one of these four subtopics would be suitable. A scoping review addressing all four will be difficult to conduct, and most importantly to synthesize in a way that will be both clear and useful.

If a concern is that there are not enough studies on SB to generate an interesting review without addressing all four, then I would suggest going in the opposite direction -- taking yet another step back and doing a scoping review to generate a concept map of the whole of the evidence regarding SB in hospitalized older adults.

As a more general matter, I also think the authors could do a better job of explaining why a scoping review in particular is warranted, as opposed to a focused systematic review. Examples of many such reasons are set out in JBI Reviewer's Manual Section 11.1. Not all reviewers are equally comfortable with scoping reviews and may reasonably ask why the authors did not "take the extra step of doing a full systematic review;" I would anticipate this question with a good explanation as to why a scoping review is not simple a "mini" systematic review, and is in fact a distinct form of review with different aims and objectives to which it is well suited.
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