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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

I write this review on your submitted protocol as a patient advocate and a consumer on Cochrane SRs.

Thank you for submitting a revised manuscript in which previous comments have been addressed. It is much appreciated. I have three comments.

Team:

I would encourage including a patient representative on the review team. As patients, or their carers/representatives, are well organised in the field of cognitive functioning, this should be feasible.

Prospero:

The previous manuscript mentions the Prospero ID CRD4201705147. This manuscript mentions CRD42017057138. But searching Google on CRD42017057138 yields no results. When searching on the protocol title in the Prospero-database, not CRD42017057138 is found but CRD4201705147. When searching Prospero on CRD42017057138, it is found though. They (147 and 138) both seem the same (with a revision). But maybe you can have a look at that, as this is a bit confusing.

Outcomes:

My major concern is regarding the outcomes, or rather, the lack of specificity thereof. They are listed very generically, which could lead to selective outcome reporting. I would strongly encourage the authors to adhere to MECIR standards regarding selecting outcomes. This means to predefine at protocol stage primary and secondary outcome domains and outcome measures, to select outcomes that are important to the stakeholders and that at least one primary outcome is about benefit for patients and one on potential harms. Also up to seven outcomes should be identified for GRADE assessment.

Please check MECIR recommendations C14-C18 on selecting outcomes (http://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-conduct-new-cochrane-intervention-
reviews-c1-75/developing-protocol-review-c1-23/selecting-outcomes-be-addressed-studies-included-review-c14-18).

I therefore would kindly advice that these comments could be addressed in a revision, especially the comment on outcomes, and wish the authors best of luck in doing so.

With kind regards,

Bernd Arents
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