Dear Dr. Beebe,

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to review "Programme Reporting Standards (PRS) for improving the reporting of sexual, reproductive, maternal, newborn, child, and adolescent health programmes"
health programmes," Manuscript BMRM-D-17-00099). This manuscript presents an interesting method to report contextual and implementation issues of SRMNCAH programs.

The authors have written the manuscript well. There is great interest to BMC Medical Research Methodology readership. The results are clearly presented in the tables of the Delphi participants, PRS consultations, and piloting. Furthermore, the five domains of the PRS are clearly presented in the PRS list. There is a clear reason given for developing the PRS. The background describes the previous developed guidelines and lack of a gold standard. Thus, they deliver a new method to standardize reports of programs.

Interest to Readership of BMC Medical Research Methodology: High

Originality: Medium to High

Conclusion Validity: High

Request of minor revisions.

1. Lines 132-150. The authors mention inviting 81 experts. There is a clear description of who the experts are and the timing of the Delphi process. They also mention the 20 in the review of those of highest relevance for the PRS. However, there is not a description of how they decided whom to invite. What was the inclusion criteria?

2. An additional table with descriptions of the open-ended comments from (1) clarification of items, (2) justification of items (3) how PRS will be used, and (4) programme results would aid the reader with how authors developed Table 4. These are included in the supplements but an actual table with some of the comments can clarify such reasons for the items included in the current Table 4.

3. Lines 284-286. By whom? It was difficult to determine who gave much attention to the role of context in program reporting and who made the decision to include context. Did the group decide that in the interactive expert meeting?

4. Table 3 in the Supplement was extremely helpful to read. I had mentioned including Comment 2 as a table (largely because Overarching issues raised by the Delphi participants was a portion of the results section). Item rankings and suggestions is also its
own section. This would justify having Table 3 in the Supplements a main table for this manuscript.

I wish for the Editorial Board of BMC Medical Research Methodology to accept this manuscript after minor essential revisions.

Yours truly,
Theresa Kim, PhD
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