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Reviewer's report:

The investigators describe the results of a systematic mapping review. Please address the following issues.

I have concerns with the suitability of the article for this journal. As it is currently written the link between this work and pilot studies is not obvious. Intervention development is an important piece that often precedes piloting, but this work is not positioned in way to inform the readership of this journal.

Otherwise it is written clearly. The methodological choices are justified.

The conclusions in the abstract do not tie with the material presented. How can this information help future intervention developers?

Please provide further details on the "category of published approach taken." Page 5, line20.

Write PRISMA in full at first use.

Write PROSPERO in full at first use and report the registration number.

The section on inclusion and exclusion criteria could be tidied up. For example, the search strategy specifies "English language" so it should not be an exclusion criterion. Since journal articles are part of the inclusion, there is no need to report dissertations, thesis, reports, grey literature as exclusion criteria. Also, if you have "Interventions with a health-related outcome" as an inclusion criterion, you shouldn't have "Studies with no health-related outcome" as an exclusion criterion.

Page 17, line 4: what is a "large minority"?

In the PRISMA diagram, please provide the reasons for excluding the 94 full text i.e.. The number of articles for each reason.

Action 10 addresses piloting and feasibility in part, but this could be highlighted.
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