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Reviewer's report:

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

The manuscript is much improved and the objectives are now formulated in such a way that they justify the use of a scoping review methodology. Accordingly, I recommend that the journal ACCEPT the manuscript for publication, though I offer a few suggestions to further improve the work below.

GENERAL

Do you really need to distinguish between SB and SBB? Sometimes you refer to just SB as the subject of your review, and then to both, which can be a bit distracting and even confusing. I think you can just refer to SB because I think it would inherently including SBB. Either way, I'd make it consistent.

ABSTRACT

Lines 12-14: I would change the last sentence of the Background to "The objective of this scoping review is to produce a literature map identifying the key domains represented in the literature concerning sedentary behaviour in hospitalised older people." This is how I would prefer that you describe the paper's aims throughout. You are reviewing the literature, and not SBB itself.

Lines 28: As you're proposing a protocol, I would leave it to the reader decide if your approach is "rigorous."

BACKGROUND

19-22: Again, I'd use the objective formulation stated above.

Data Management:

5-8: Do you really need to go into this much detail to justify using EndNote? I think it's obvious why you'd use a bibliographic management software, so it's enough to just state which one you're using. Also, include a parenthetical identifying the company that makes the software and where they're headquartered (this is customary).
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