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Reviewer’s report:

Title: "messier" instead of "Messier"

Abstract, line 1: "guide" not "quide"

Abstract: it would be useful for the four amendments to be briefly described in the abstract

Keyword: please consider replacing "TIDieR" with a different keyword

Background, page 5, para 2: The following reference is pertinent to the discussion of the use of TIDieR in systematic reviews: Hoffmann, T.C., Oxman, A.D., Ioannidis, J.P., Moher, D., Lasserson, T.J., Tovey, D.I., Stein, K., Sutcliffe, K., Ravaud, P., Altman, D.G. and Perera, R., 2017. Enhancing the usability of systematic reviews by improving the consideration and description of interventions. bmj, 358, p.j2998.

Page 6, para 1: shorten "British Medical Journal" to "BMJ"

Background: A general background to TIDieR is offered before the aim of the paper is stated. The section would be strengthened if the rationale for the focus of the paper was made clearer. For example, why do we need to know your experience? How would this be useful to readers? Also, you state that the aim is to describe "the experience…" - I think it should be clearer from the start whose experience will be described.

Methods, page 6: define NDH at first use

Methods, page 6/Table 2: please clarify in the text and table what the intervention is for (ii) and (iii). Is it the same intervention as (i)? In general the description of the clinical problems and interventions in table 2 could be clearer.

Table 2: "TIDieR" instead of "TIDIER" in the column header

Methods, lines 18-20: This text refers to results, not methods. Please edit accordingly. When editing this section, please can you clarify what the purpose of the consensus workshops was, the number and brief description of the researchers involved, and the process for identifying issues, themes and potential amendments to TIDieR. In relation to the second point, the authors currently use the term "we" several times, and it isn't clear whether this is just referring to the
authors or a/the broader group of researchers involved in the workshops. Overall, as currently written, the article seems like an opinion piece rather than original research.

Results: I think it would help if this section opened with a summary of the results, for example, that four key themes and four potential amendments were identified, before going on to explain these in further detail.

It is stated that the data generated during the studies are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. Please clarify what data you are referring to here. Transcripts from the consensus workshops?

Appendix 1 - Please amend the intervention descriptions so that they are presented in a consistent format.

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

No

**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.

No

**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:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:
1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal