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Reviewer's report: Thank you for the opportunity to review this short report manuscript which presents a perspective on using concept mapping with stakeholders to address development of pragmatic measurement criteria. The introduction provides a succinct analysis of the background literature and the methods sections clearly presents the processes for undertaking this work. The previous systematic review described in data collection (page 5 line 29) and semi-structured interview study are referenced to (9), however, upon checking this reference (conference abstract), I found that no details of the results from these previous activities. Please provide more information about the characteristics of studies that met inclusion criteria and the number of interviews conducted. This should be feasible given that the manuscript length is currently under the allowable word count for a short report.

The results section begins with a description about the 24 stakeholders rating activities. The second paragraph (line 36) notes that 'stakeholders and an International Advisory Board also vetted the four-cluster solution…' However, this process is not described in the methods. It is not clear if these are the same or different stakeholders to n=24 (I assume this group is different). If they are a different group, please clarify how they were selected and asked to participate in the process. Information about the International Advisory Board is described in the acknowledgements section and the additional members who participated (and are not authors) are identified. Please clarify how these additional participants were selected. The presentation of results regarding the rating of the 47 criteria is detailed, both in terms of the written justification and the use of illustrations to demonstrate the use of scaling and cluster analysis.

The discussion highlights that the activities undertaken are the first steps in a longer process to develop and test rating criteria that will inform the development of new measures, or to rate the level of pragmatism to be found in existing scales. With these intentions in mind, it would be helpful for the authors to develop precise definitions for the criteria of acceptable, useful, easy and compatible, to assist with transparency and utility for future users. These minor revisions will make the intended Delphi process easier to structure.
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