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Reviewer's report:

Review of "Ensuring children and young people are heard in core outcome set development: suggestions from international workshops with 70 children and young people."

The topic of the article is interesting, and the timing is good given that young people's voices are being questioned in the current debate on the global environment crisis worldwide, with arguments that we can not listen to them because of their age or lack of college degree. This is of course nonsense. Therefore, it feels very comforting to read this Commentary.

It is my opinion that the article in general is very well-written and easy to understand. I can only add a few comments on some unclarities I have identified and would also suggest the authors have a look at the paper for editing as there are a few typos. Should these minor things be addressed, I would be happy to make the recommendation to publish.

General comments: Throughout the paper the authors use the term and abbreviation CYP, but they never state whether this means CYPs in general or those with the condition, i.e. patients. This I find problematic as for adults it is normally patients or patient representatives that are invited to participate in COS, not any adults in general or 'the general public'. I would suggest this to be explained early on in the manuscript, as now it is unclear to the reader, even still at the end of the paper.

The title is very long, anything that can be done to shorten it, would be good.

Other comments: The heading "Main text" seems out of context and should be removed. In the first paragraph under Main text, the authors introduce iCAN, however this introduction is way too short and gives the reader almost no information about this network. I am left with many questions. How come iCAN was chosen? Are there other networks like this one? Who are their members? From what countries? Can anyone become a member? How? Is iCAN only concerned with health matters? Given the topic of this paper, I think a whole paragraph only introducing iCAN is justified and is needed for readers to understand the context.

In the final sentence of this paragraph, the authors state that they "are unable to provide demographic details on delegates". This is very unsatisfying and I wonder if there is really no information at all? Do they for example know, which one might expect, if the majority of those participating was male or female? Sick or not sick? Closer to age 10 than age 18? Surely there must be some more information we could get here, especially as the authors later in the
manuscript draw the conclusion that "the iCAN delegates we consulted were typically rom high-income backgrounds and countries". Either the authors do not have this information and can therefore not draw such a conclusion, or they do have information which in that case should have been presented much earlier.

In the next section under the heading "How were the workshops organised and facilitated?" the authors describe their methods. It is however unclear to me how their method is different from focus groups - which I suppose it must be as this term is not mentioned at all. In the 2nd paragraph it is stated that "...all had experience of patient and public involvement (PPI), COS development, or both with CYP". But did they have any experience of leading discussions in focus groups or in moderating workshops or other events?

Minor remarks: It would have been good had there been page numbers to refer to, this needs to be added.

List of abbreviations should be presented earlier, preferably at the beginning of the paper rather than at the end of the document, which is too late.

Language generally very good but needs to be checked as on several places as words are missing, for example line 15, same page as Main text starts, is an incomplete sentence. Another example: in Box 2, in the 4th bullet item in the 2nd section an "of" is missing. I therefore recommend the authors to have the paper proof-read.

Difficult words for non-native English speakers - hover, deter, interspersing - please explain or change these words.
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