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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

This is a very important research question that should be addressed. I think this a good piece of work. Most of the work process is stated clearly.

It should be stated more clearly that identifying and developing core outcomes is not the objective that it will be conducted in another project.

I read the second manuscript with the track changes - when I stated numbers, these are the lines of the manuscript:

- To be transparent you can register your protocol at openscienceframework (https://osf.io/) for example.

- Pre-specification of outcomes at the protocol stage, i.e. before data collection and analyses have been done, prevents decisions, such as which outcomes, which specific measurements, and which time-points should be examined, from being influenced by the knowledge of the results(3) - I could not find this information in the Cochrane Handbook

- MA should not be abbreviated or the abbreviation explained before

- Table 1: 3) Specific metric or format of Outcome data that will be used for Analysis - would not it be rather a weight measurement as kg/pounds than any value

- Is it 66% to 75%? Why are there two percentages?

- Objectives: to improve food security in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) through your methods work is a consequence but not a direct one, that is a much longer shot

- Objectives: Our findings will contribute to discussions about the best approach to pre-specify outcomes for SRs and Primary research in the field of food security and to identify core outcomes for this area. - I am not completely sure what that means, would you like to do a further mehtods project doing interviews with experts presetning them your list of identified outcomes?
-136-137: I would make it clearer that identifying and developing core outcomes is not part of your methods study but would lead to a further study/Investigation

-Methods: would be protocols also included or not, that is not consistent in the methods section

-179: I am not sure if the search is sufficient, EMBASE? Epistemonikos? search strategy should be added
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