

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Overview of a Formal Scoping Review on Health System Report Cards

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 26 July 2009

**Reviewer:** France Legare

### **Reviewer's report:**

The authors have done a very good job at addressing most of the reviewers' comments. I believe there is value in helping the authors getting their manuscript published because it can help others reflect on the strengths and the limitations of scoping reviews. However, I notice that they went from a manuscript with almost 300 references to only 8 references in the current manuscript. Noteworthy, only one reference, number 8, is used in the discussion section thus suggesting that perhaps the discussion section is underdeveloped in regards with the existing literature on report cards, scoping reviews and knowledge transfer and exchange with stakeholders. In other words, although the authors need to be congratulated for the extensive scoping review they have produced and their presentation of its detailed stepwise approach, I believe they could have done a better job in the discussion section by comparing their results with those from other scoping reviews. They could also have cited relevant work when addressing strengths and limitations of scoping reviews. For example as of today, using the key words "scoping review" in Pubmed retrieves 62 hits with one that appears to be relevant: A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. Grant MJ, Booth A. Health Info Libr J. 2009 Jun;26(2):91-108.

Also, although i agree that the scoping review process does not permit to assess the quality of all included articles, it would have been interesting to read from the authors' point of view, what were their views on the quality assessment process of scoping reviews. In other words, how can one assess the quality of scoping reviews? Wouldn't there be an interesting opportunity here for future work for the EQUATOR network?

Last, based on the revised manuscript, I would suggest that the authors used the following wording in their conclusions: "Scoping reviews may be useful.... and may be of used to researchers and stakeholders" instead of stating that "Scoping reviews are useful..."

Major (but not compulsory):

Add a bit more in the discussion section regarding the state of the knowledge base pertaining to scoping reviews in general since this seems to be a major accomplishment of this work (to add to the knowledge base of scoping reviews). Therefore, add few relevant references in this regard. However, I am happy for the editor to reinforce or not this comment.

Minor:

Please revise the "too" strong statements in the conclusion section.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

'I declare that I have no competing interests'