Reviewer's report

Title: Processes, Contexts and Rationale for Disinvestment: A Protocol for a Critical Interpretive Synthesis

Version: 1 Date: 6 October 2014

Reviewer: Julie Polisena

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the study design appropriate?

Given the dearth of evidence and unpublished literature on this topic, one concern would be the validity of the framework development that is based primarily on the literature. Prior to determining the study design, was a literature scoping review conducted? I would emphasize data collection from policy makers, HTA producers and health service researchers as an important source of information to inform the proposed framework.

Will a quality assessment of the selected literature be conducted? If not, what is the rationale for not doing so?

In the data extraction form, it may be worthwhile to include health care technology and health services reviewed as trends may be identified (e.g., some technologies and services may be more controversial, etc.).

What was the rationale for conducting 1-day workshop versus a Delphi study to solicit feedback from the policy makers and researchers on the proposed framework?

Who is the target audience for the study results?

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

I suggest including the databases to be searched, main search terms, language(s), and search timeframe.

For the unpublished (or grey) literature, I suggest referencing "Grey Matters" guide published by CADTH.

Please clarify, will the 18-22 workshop participants include both policy makers and researchers? If so, how was the number of participants determined to ensure that various perspectives are considered?

What is the design to solicit feedback from the workshop participants (e.g., will a facilitator be involved)?
3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?
Not applicable.

4. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is acceptable.