Reviewer’s report

Title: Evaluation of the Cochrane Consumers and Communication Group’s systematic review priority setting project

Version: 0 Date: 13 May 2020

Reviewer: Linda Brennan

Reviewer's report:

Overall, I enjoyed reading the paper and it is nice to see an evaluation of a program being undertaken (thank you).

I found the statement that there was a 10 item conceptual framework a little difficult to get my head around in that there are in fact 27 items and 10 criteria. Of course this is probably not a big deal but it made for and overall lack of readability.

In my opinion I think more could have been made of the areas for improvement in terms of the conclusions that were based on the results. The conclusion overall seemed a little truncated to me and this is a missed opportunity in terms of advising the research world about how evaluations could be performed and used to improve services.

Table 1 the framework for the process evaluation is a nice way of ensuring consumer and user inclusion in projects, as well as stakeholders. Again I think more of this framework would be useful and some tabulation of data (which you refer to as being done) would be helpful in terms of understanding how this framework could be applied to other projects.

Overall, I think some further argumentation that allows the reader to follow your thinking and to understand what the purpose of this research is would be helpful. I don't understand what the proposed contribution is and I am left inferring what you think based on my own experiences. It would be preferable to me if some further argumentation was available that allowed me to follow your thinking.

I find the use of the word empiric data disconcerting. In consumer research and health promotion research (which I am most familiar with) the word is empirical. The word empirical is concerned with the Platonc or Aristotelean (I have forgotten and it is not worth looking for the correct citation as I am probably just being a nerd) use of the term to describe something which is observable through the five senses.

In terms of the priority setting process much could be made of the methodologies of including consumers. It is sad that the most effective methods for obtaining consumer and stakeholder feedback are discounted on account of limited resources (page 8). What does this mean for further research? What are your suggestions to overcome this type of problem?

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I wish you luck in your research endeavours.
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