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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper by Tong and colleagues in which they present a reporting guideline for research priority setting exercises. They have provided a convincing rationale for the work and I have no doubt that the manuscript has great potential to become a highly referenced and impactful publication.

I only have some minor suggestions to further improve the manuscript:

1) Methods, pg 7: Include a brief summary of the 'sensitive search strategies' in the main text so that readers can get an idea of the key search terms without having to go into the supplement

2) Page 10, lines 9/10: an example or further explanation of what may be considered 'credible leadership' would be helpful

3) Page 10, lines 58/59: could the authors provide 1 or 2 examples of particular situations/types of priority setting exercises where use -and therefore reporting- of a framework would not be expected?

4) It is not entirely clear how to interpret item 25 (output) as a reporting recommendation. It is the only item in Table 1 not formulated as such (e.g. 'Describe how...'; 'State why...'). Does it refer to the fact that authors of priority setting exercises should state their approach to formulating the priorities (e.g. as a PICO, as a topic), so that it is clear what the priorities refer to? Or does it imply that authors should check that their priorities are formulated clearly (in which case some more guidance on how to do that would be helpful)?

5) Discussion, page 16 lines 19-41: I am unsure what the authors are trying to get across with the last paragraph of the Discussion. Is it about items that have been missed but might be relevant in future updates? Is it about supporting evidence for some of the items already included? Or about something else entirely? It would be helpful if the authors could state in the first sentence of the paragraph what its key point is and how it relates their findings.

6) Minor textual errors: (a) Abstract - first sentence of Methods paragraph: „for were searched" needs to be removed; (b) Background, pg 4 line 15: 'was prioritized' should be 'were prioritized'.
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