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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written article, but reports on a very small piece of work, and is of limited interest as it stands. This is one of a series of activities, including an online survey (already published), this single workshop and a set of actions for future Cochrane reviews. It is interesting that five sets of authors are now working on reviews, taking into account the actions from this work.

The work will be of greater interest if the results of this workshop (run in 2015) are a small part of the wider work, and are included with further work assessing the 5 reviews, including the experiences of the review teams (what they did differently) to incorporate the recommendations and the reactions/responses of consumers and professionals of the 'new' format of the five reviews. This would provide a more substantial piece of work that will enable others to learn lessons and improve the useability of future systematic reviews. There should have been time, in the intervening 3 years, for the reviews to be complete.

There were 151 responses to the online survey, which is not a huge response given the breadth of interest in this area. This paper is reporting on the discussions and deliberations of a workshop of 28 people, not really representative of the wider community. The authors claim this is international, but the majority of participants (and authors) are Australian. I don't think the results of the single workshop with 28 people can directly lead to the conclusion in the paper 'Consumers, health professionals and health decision makers want Cochrane Reviews that address the underlying structural and cultural challenges in health communication and participation, and in doing so explicitly consider health equity'.

The paper talks about strengths, but does not include anything about the limitations of the work. The strengths are largely process oriented about the actual workshop itself, and it is debatable whether the group itself was representative of wider consumers, as claimed. There are limitations around including 'professional representatives' whose interests are often different from the groups that they are to represent. This is a huge dilemma, much commented on in the literature, as it is important that groups actively involve consumers and other stakeholders - so more about these issues would be more relevant for reporting on this work.
Work to include people/consumers/etc in decision making about health issues is really important, but the same issues are still arising after many years of discussion/action.

There are 17 authors on this paper, reporting on a workshop with 28 people.
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