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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

This article addresses the challenges faced by health researchers seeking the most current evidence published in the most relevant literature. There is a vast amount of literature available for consideration, and access to that literature has increased significantly.

Making literature reviews faster and more accessible, while retaining rigour stands to facilitate "service redesign (p.2)" and ensure change of healthcare practice "at pace (p.2)." New approaches to literature review are needed.

The article very clearly describes PaCERS methodology and demonstrates its potential. It provides excellent examples of all tools/assessments used in the process. It clearly articulates what a PaCERS review is meant to do.

It would be better, however, to consider this a non-research article, as it does not provide data in relation to the development and testing of the methodology.

A major revision could clarify the article's intent and contribute substantially to knowledge in the area of rapid reviews.

Line Comments

In general, it would be helpful to discuss PaCERS in terms of either a single review or more generically. The article appears to do a bit of both. For example, Line 287: I am not certain I know what "our report" is. This seems to be discussing a single review and not the overall review process for all reviews.

Line 78: suggest citation next to "key principles of knowledge synthesis"

Line 85: "find evidence they need to support changes to their clinical practice" - This statement might be strengthened by also clarifying how potential bias is reduced during a PaCERS review.

Line 99: Can you clarify what the "research team" is? This is a term not used throughout the article. Is this referring to those requesting the review? Along these lines, the article might benefit from standardizing language. For example, "end-users" are described, but so are "requesters." Are these the same?
It would be helpful to know what the Line 110: "themes" were that enabled you to understand stakeholder interests and attitudes.

Line 129: It would help to clarify, as you have stated in Figure 1, that protocols are registered in Prospero, "if appropriate."

Regarding use of SPICE and PICO. Do you document the reason/justification for not adhering to the structure of these frameworks in individual situations? This would be interesting to know.

Line 161: suggest citation next to "the PICO framework" and "SPICE framework"

Line 173: The discussion regarding logic models - this appears to be something that you may or may not include in a review process. More explanation about how you plan to explore and test this would be helpful. Would it be possible to include an example?

Given there can often be significant overlap between results from different databases, can you please address how you determine the best mix of databases to search?

What is the process you go through to identify sources for grey literature? How do you find relevant sites?

Line 236: "the decision YES, NO or MAYBE" do you mean "YES or MAYBE?" Why retrieve those that are a NO?

Line 236: How do you document the screening process? Do you use a specific program or spreadsheets? It would be interesting to know if you are using a review program like EPPI Reviewer 4.

Line 239: Figure 1: Study Selection using Endnote states, "Discrepancies resolved by 3rd reviewer." This is not consistent with page 11 line 239: which states that "discrepancies are resolved by discussion, or with the involvement of a third reviewer."

Regarding impact, it would be helpful to know more information about how the results from reviews have been used so far. Line 331 very interestingly discusses that the reviews have had an "impact on conversations between researches, clinicians and patients." How so? What happened? Can you please provide more detail relating to the results and effectiveness of the searches?
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