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Reviewer's report:

Review of the manuscript “A framework for stakeholder identification in health research: A novel process and its application to older adult mobility and the built environment”, Claire Schiller, Meghan Winters, Heather M. Hanson, Maureen C. Ashe.

Frédéric Mertens, University of Brasilia, Brazil

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The research question is clearly defined, in the abstract as well as in the introduction. The information provided allow the reader to decide right away whether it is worth reading the full manuscript according to his/her specific interests.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods are well described, as is the procedure to build the maps of stakeholders in the result section.

Minor Essential Revision:

p.7: The authors inform that “We identified relevant literature through an Ovid Medline keyword search of ‘stakeholder analysis’ and ‘concept mapping’ (years 1950–present); then reviewed retrieved articles for relevance to older adult mobility and the built environment”. I welcome the authors to provide additional quantitative information regarding on how many articles were retrieved and then selected. There is a mention that thirty- two papers were included in the review on p.10. However it would be preferable to include this information upfront in the Methods section.

3. Are the data sound?
   The article does not rely on primary data collection. Instead, results describe an iterative process of inquiry to identify a comprehensive list of stakeholders. This process is well described and offers clear guidance to researchers from other domains whishing to apply the same approach to identify and map stakeholders groups. The framework presented is general enough to allow application in other (non Canadian) cultural contexts as well.

Minor Essential Revision:
Results section: It is interesting to note that in the “Policy makers and governments” stakeholders’ category presented on Figure 2, the authors clearly identified the multiple levels of political organization (municipal, provincial, federal). This multi-level perspective is extremely useful to public health research and practice. However, no information in the description of the mapping process is presented regarding on how these levels were identified or why they were included in the first place. Some information on this identification process would be very useful.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Not applicable.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes. They acknowledge the contribution of several expert informants that reviewed and provided feedback on an initial draft of the stakeholder framework.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The title is clear and informative. The abstract is well structured and provides all necessary information to invite the reader to go across the entire manuscript.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   The writing is excellent, the language is direct, clear, to the point. This makes the paper accessible to a wide audience, including non-native English readers.

10. Additional comments:
    Minor Essential Revisions:

    p.6: Change “then” to “than” in the following sentence: This method is notably less structured than others, and may be supplemented with interviews of a cross-section of stakeholders.

    Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

    Quality of written English: Acceptable

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