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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are major issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

N/A - no methodology

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

N/A - no results to interpret
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The objective is to report the experience during the development of questionnaire for a cohort study in Lolland-Falster island, Denmark.

The manuscript has a non-usual format of a narrative text. The article is a description of notes collected and there is no hypothesis to support the motivation of its execution. The interpretation needs to be expanded, in order to point out the potential solution and future directions.

Overall, this is an interesting topic to explore. There are few articles discussing the methodology of questionnaires for use in community surveys. So, this is the originality and the utility of the article.

The text is based on personal experience and notes taken during the development of the tool. There is no quantitative assessment.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. The objective should be stated at the end of Introduction.

2. This is a qualitative report, but not an experimental study nor needs a quantitative assessment.

3. Data collection and questionnaire development were performed in accordance with multiple sources of demand (stakeholder, participant, scientific question, etc). Personal notes is quite subjective. I would like to know who have taken these notes and how were organized?

4. The interpretation of the sources of difficulty is one-by-one. Core findings were compared with similar studies, but authors would do better if can made some recommendations or proposal for other researchers.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The manuscript is submitted to the BMC Medical Research Methodology. I suggest the following journal: Progress in Community Health Partnerships.
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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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