Reviewer’s report

Title: Using the Nominal Group Technique to Involve Young People in an Evidence Synthesis which Explored 'Risk' in Inpatient Mental Healthcare

Version: 0 Date: 05 Jul 2017

Reviewer: Hugh McLaughlin

Reviewer’s report:

Adapting the Nominal Group Technique to Include Views of Young People in an Evidence Synthesis of Risk in Hospital Mental Health Care

Thank you for your article which I enjoyed and is well written and clearly structured. The article identifies how the researchers adapted the nominal group technique to create a structure and a process to ensure young people's voices were heard and how this helped to shape the focus of a hospital based mental health care evidence synthesis to be more responsive to the issues important for young people.

There is a good description of the implementation of the nominal group technique in operation and I also agree that icebreakers in such situations could be helpful. However, I was not clear whether ethical approval was provided for the nominal group technique involvement process, and if so this should be stated. If not, you need to say why this was not necessary and how you were able to ensure that all stakeholder interests were protected.

I also identified the minor points below.

P7L132 missing word - invite 'other' young people to join him

L134 how were the young people prepared beforehand?

P11L219 dislocation - isolation from….social contact -even if in hospital young people would have social contact, should this be normal social contact?

It is noticeable that your results perceive risk in a negative way, is there a reason for this, especially as you previously mention the importance of risk for building resilience?
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