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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript presents a protocol aiming to improve the development of guidelines through meaningful and equitable multi-stakeholder engagement. This is a multi-stage project consisting of series of four systematic reviews. In first step, the results of the reviews will be used in developing the draft for guidance recommendations. In second step, an online survey will be conducted to get feedback on draft from guideline developers and external stakeholders. In third and fourth steps, the survey results be discussed among stakeholders' groups and finally the guidance will be developed. The protocol addresses an interesting topic, but the title of the manuscript is not clear as it does not mention that these guidelines are related to healthcare. Overall, the manuscript needs some editing to improve the quality of the writing.

Here are few suggestions for "major and minor revision" to improve the readability of this study.

Major Revisions

Title:

* The title of the manuscript is not clear as it does not tell the reader that guidelines are related to what. The reader of the paper does not get the idea until he/she reaches the discussion section where the authors talk about the improvement of health outcomes and reducing inequities in health.

Background:

* Paragraph 4 is appearing twice in background: "Equitable engagement of multiple stakeholder groups can help to ensure that guidelines contribute to reducing health ...........".
Search strategy:

* There does not appear to be a section in manuscript on the Limitations that may influence the results (e.g. including only English language studies; only the studies from 1946 to November 15, 2018).

* Authors have mentioned more than one database under search strategy, but in additional file 5, only Ovid MEDLINE is mentioned and search strategies for other databases are also missing.

Additional file 3:

* In table header, please fix the term 'Principal investing-ators' and replace it with Principal investigators

Minor Revisions

Background:

* Please remove the extra spacing before 'any' in this line: "This in turn may lead to improved adherence to any treatments and practices recommended".

* Please add a space between cycle and parenthesis in this line: "Stakeholder engagement in guideline development is part of a wider acceptance by the research community of the value of ensuring the participation of end-users in the research and knowledge translation cycles(18,19)".

* Please fix these lines as these are not clear: "Stakeholders will have different levels of time, resources and skills available to dedicate to the process, and ensuring that these differences do not result in differential influence over the final guideline recommendations is important."
Authors needs to be consistent throughout reporting the references. On some places full stop appears before reference parenthesis () and on others it appears after parenthesis.

Key definitions:

Please add 'level of engagement' in this line: "We define below the terms guideline, stakeholder, stakeholder engagement, and under-represented groups used for this project".

A full stop is missing at the end of this line: "A stakeholder is any "individual or group who is responsible for or affected by…………………".

Please remove double quotation marks before knowledge users in this line: "Further, we acknowledge that ….. (CIHR terms these stakeholders, "knowledge users),……".

Please add 'and' after the word prioritising in this line: "…… (e.g. commenting, advising, ranking, voting, prioritising, reaching consensus)
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