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Reviewer's report:

A valuable paper; Hope to see it published soon.

Title

I could not see the reason why the authors call this TRANSFER Framework. TRANSFER is all caps is referring to an acronym that does not exist. I think it is better to be removed and the title could be simply "systematic mapping of checklists for assessing transferability". Adding TRANSFER Framework is not implying any information.

General Comment

I think the authors have missed the fact that systematic review questions are based on some of very famous frameworks such as PICOS and its variants, SPICE, SPIDER, PIPOH, and ECLIPSE. Although there is a mention of PICO however the other frameworks already include research conduct, implementation and environmental context. It looks like that the team has done a massive effort to map what have already been mapped within the existing frameworks for developing a review question. The added values of the paper are overviewing the checklists, the details of sub-themes, and focusing on transferability.

Background

It is very long while the point of paper could be made in a very shorter format.

Thesis statement of the paper could be mentioned in one sentence as the end of Background; however the authors explain their aims while there is a separate heading for Aims. It looks like to be redundant.
Aims

Either the aim should be the last sentence of the Background or the aims mentioned in the background should be removed.

Methods

Eligibility Criteria

I think the authors could move certain parts in a shorter format to Search Strategy as: We searched the relevant literature without limitations to publication type, publication status, publication language, or publication date."

I know the authors mention they included 6 languages but if there are relevant papers in other languages they could still cite and report them in Limitations section.

"Papers that discussed transferability, and issues which could influence transferability, at a theoretical level were not included". This sentence is exclusion criteria but in the middle of inclusion criteria. Please move it to the next paragraph.

Eligibility Criteria could be reported as Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria in bulleted points format.

Exclusion of six checklists assessing transferability of economic evaluations + guidelines + two non-English checklists should be mentioned as Limitations not Exclusion Criteria. Transferability associated to these publication types are very relevant to systematic reviews and excluding them is a limitation. Guidelines follow PIPOH framework which is inclusive of some of the themes in results already. In the results also there is a mention of 'who pays for the interventions' and 'implementing organization, (e.g., financial' both emphasize the importance of economic evaluations.

Search Strategy

The paper is as old as its search date. The search has done in 2016 June which is 1 year and 9 months old. We usually recommend that the search should not be older than 6 months of submission date.

ProQuest and Web of Science are not databases. Please format the actual searched sources as reported correctly in Appendix.

Study Selection

Please add Covidence after "a web-based tool,".
Results

Discrepancy between the text and figure: twenty-seven in text=26 in figure; six relevant checklists=5 in figure; 33 relevant checklists=31 in figure.

Repeating the numbers from figure within the text is not adding value.

Page 18: it seems to be Table 5 not Table 1.

Bibliographic information of 101 excluded references + 6 checklists assessing transferability of economic evaluations + two non-English checklists should be shared as Appendix. It is a finding and will help the readers to identify and use them.

Discussion

This mapping finds new terminology from the literature that should be fed back into the search strategy to find more literature for the future research. In addition, to have a good interview guide (structured conversation guide) for the rest of the research it is better the team have a look at existing frameworks for review questions as well: a good list presented in Oxford EvidenceLive 2016 as 'PICO Framework: Two Decades of Variation and Application' including SPIDER, SPICE and ECLIPSE.

Checking reference lists, citations, and contacting the experts are part of search methods. Contacting the experts should be mentioned in the methods.
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