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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is an important contribution to the further professionalization of the field of health research priority setting. It is clearly structured and well written. The quality of the research is good and I only have a few minor comments.

P2, line 17: "We searched electronic databases and relevant websites for were searched for sources …." Something is wrong here.

P4, lines 39-44: Please number the four objectives for clarity as (1) ... (2) .... (3) ...., and (4) ....
P4, line 39: "meets" should be "meet"

P5, line 33: Yes, it is true that there are frameworks and guidelines available for conducting and evaluating research priority setting and there are no published guidelines for reporting. But this should not be interpreted as if research in these areas is not needed anymore. I am participating in the PARADIGM project that amongst others investigates frameworks for evaluating research priority setting exercises. We found that there are very few frameworks and they mainly focus on process criteria and indicators and very little is available on outcomes and impact.

P10, line 31 and 38: As one of the authors of the article on the Dialogue model, included in the study, I noticed here that under B) Governance and Team the Dialogue model was not referred to while it has clear emphasis on the issues of equity and facilitation. Could you please add reference [36] to line 31 "…equity[12,36]." And line 38 "… mixed stakeholders[5,36]."
This also applies to p11, line 29 "… priority setting exercises[5,12,21,36,39]

P12, lines 26 and 46 present statements about "some priority setting exercises…", but no reference is made to any of the studied articles.
P12, line 43 uses for the references the superscript typography instead of […]

P13, lines 24-26 state "the use of criteria can add complexity to the process…". I would like to emphasize that subsequently attaching scores to such criteria (as some do) followed by adding up the scores and prioritizing the research topics on the basis of the highest scores may sound rational but actually gives a false sense of objectivity.

P15, on conflict of interest, it is relevant to explicitly request to address the possible influence of pharmaceutical companies on the research agenda setting process, given their close ties with both patient organizations and medical doctors this is by no means a hypothetical possibility.

P15, line 22 explicitly states that "The REPRISE Guideline is intended to facilitate transparent and comprehensive reporting of research priority setting studies that involve stakeholders." However, in line 54 it is stated "The REPRISE Guideline may be used as a roadmap for designing, planning and
reporting of research priority setting studies, …". This is first of all confusing, but it is also not substantiated that the guidelines can be used for designing and planning (besides reporting). I would be very careful of making this claim, given that you clearly stated one sentence above that the guidelines do not say anything about the quality of the conduct in research priority setting studies. It only states the items that preferably are reported on and does not help someone in selecting from among several options the right course of action under certain circumstances.

P16, lines 19-24: "A systematic review has found evidence for some of the items influencing decision-making about technical issues by mixed groups of people, and evidence for other factors that we have not seen specifically in the literature addressing decision making about research priorities[46]." This is a rather cryptic sentence. I don't understand what you mean.

P30, Table 1, number C 11: Please add the Dialogue Model when listing the other three models James Lind Alliance, COHRED, CHNRI, as you have also done in Table 2.

P32, Table 2, Dialogue Model, Principles/Values: "Participatory, respect for experiential knowledge, dialogue between different stakeholders, emergent and flexible design". So please add "between different stakeholders" and "design".
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