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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript that reflects on the utility of the TIDieR checklist and makes recommendations for minor revisions to the checklist.

This is a very clear and well written paper. My sense is that the content of the paper is a bit stretched presented as a research article and perhaps would make a better contribution framed as a debate - TIDieR or Messier?.

There is quite a bit of description of the checklist within the main text of the paper and repetition of ideas between the results and a very short discussion.

However, I think a rich and insightful debate on the utility of reporting checklists centred on the main ideas in this paper (capturing change over time, whose voice the checklist represents and what purpose it serves, capturing contextual influences and using checklists as a research tool) would make a timely contribution to thinking and practice in this field.

The authors have considerable experience using the TIDieR checklist across a range of studies and settings, and perhaps a more reflective format would allow for more indepth and thoughtful critique of the role of reporting checklists and discussion of their experiences.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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