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Review for the journal article

This article is very informative, I enjoyed reading it. I was particularly interested in how the team have carried out this work as I have a strong interest in ethics, maternal health and more generally in obesity reduction initiatives at a public health level. Having published a framework on ethics myself and continuing on this piece of work, I was able to fully understand how to make this piece stronger.

Title

1. Should avoid using the CCI acronym.

Abstract

2. Not clear what the acronym CCI is.

Introduction

3. Clear and easy to read and understand but would need an edit to reflect changes suggested below.

Peer reviewed literature

4. Literature searching has not included the search terms 'service user' and 'action research' can the team offer a sentence or two about why these key terms were omitted or what impact that may have on the overall piece of work? I can however see that participatory research was picked up through the articles yielded in the search.

Grey Literature search

5. Can a justification be offered about why the five leading body's CCI frameworks were identified and not others? For example the World Health Organisation has its own global strategy concerning involvement and collaboration too: https://www.who.int/healthsystems/strategy/everybodys_business.pdf?ua=1
Targeted community involvement

6. Increasingly we are being asked to reflect on the type of involvement we adopt in our own work to help add knowledge and information on reporting to journals (see GRIPP2). The kudos of reporting this information brings an element of transparency and some reassurance to the readership that there was some thought offered to why involvement happened in a particular way and within a given budget.

7. I do wonder if the type of involvement you described has been used by others and if it has, then maybe, the team could reference it as an example? I am thinking how the six people were found (the justification for their lived experience is fine - nice and clear but its the other details that are missing). Particularly why was this a the better method over other methods for example placing an advert to find people. This information might be useful for the journal readership, also especially given the nature of the article and its focus being CCI values related.

Method/process of presenting the values - this will help to bring out originality

8. Can each of the five values be grounded in references where these points have been made/listed before in the literature. If this is too tricky, how about having a short discussion about how each value base is applied within the literature of a values based framework?

9. Can a short discussion be offered about whether the five values have reached saturation/are exhaustive before proposing an evaluation?

10. An overarching theory or logic model might be helpful to tie the three tables together in one diagram. So that the users of this framework to see its robustness.

Discussion

11. A huge amount of work is going on in reproductive health within the UK and globally in the 'preconception' stage using assisted technologies (e.g. egg freezing, IVF, sperm donation etc) and I wonder why this school of work is not mentioned or discussed? I imagine bringing this back into the discussion allows the readers to remember that the framework proposed is broad enough to consider across the spectrum. Maybe give examples of the variety of health issues at preconception pregnancy and postpartum stages where health problems could be solved in the real world with this framework's help.

Conclusion

12. The team make an important point about adapting this framework to local contexts. I wonder if more can be discussed about the challenges/opportunities of its applicability. Maybe the international conversation needs to be brought in here too?
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