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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Richard and Sophie

Thank you very much for your comments on our Simple Language summary, and for the opportunity to address your points prior to peer review. In response to your specific points we have made the following amendments to the Simple Language summary and abstract:

a) We have added in a sentence briefly explaining what a "systematic review" is.

b) Thank you for pointing out the difference in tone between the opening line of the Simple Language Summary and the abstract. We consider that what we had put within both sections were correct - i.e. researchers are increasingly "expected" to have involvement, AND are increasingly recognising that this is a good thing. We have edited both the Simple Language Summary and the abstract so that both these points are stated in both sections. As a result of these clarifications we have made some other minor amendments to both sections in order to keep within the word limits.
c) Our statement that "There is limited practical guidance how to do this" relates specifically to there being limited practical guidance about how to involve people within systematic reviews, and we have amended our text to clarify this point.

We hope that these amendments adequately address the concerns which you raised about this section of our paper.

Kind regards

Alex