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Reviewer's report:

In the interest of transparency, the comments provided to the Authors are identical to those provided to the Editor.

In general, the manuscript is much improved as regards background, presentation of methods, and overall clarity.

My concern with the review as currently designed is that it is more likely to produce a narrative synthesis on a focused topic. This is more in the nature of a "rapid review," i.e., an abbreviated SR, and not a scoping review.

In particular, I have some concerns about the 'a priori' selection of the "four key domains." You cite to Lawlor et al. (J Pain Symptom Manage 2019) as justification for focusing on a limited number of "key domains" in a scoping review. However, Lawlor and colleagues derived these domains by distilling an analytical framework which was developed through an extensive expert consultation process. This doesn't appear to be the case in the protocol as proposed.

I think, therefore, that it would be important to:

1. "Step back" one level and use the scoping review to identify the key domains. This would be my preferred approach, and is more in keeping with how scoping reviews are generally performed. You have stated that a broad review would be challenging because of the limited number of articles you expect to find, but the hope would be that a properly conducted scoping review may yield more titles than your preliminary searchers.

2. Better explain your a priori selection of domains.

I would favour a review that clearly is directed to one of the following purposes:

To identify the types of available evidence in a given field
To examine how research is conducted on a certain topic
To clarify key concepts/definitions in the literature
As a precursor to a systematic review
To identify key characteristics or factors related to a concept

See https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x
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