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Reviewer’s report:

Arevalo-Rodriguez et al present a protocol for an international survey and expert consultation to determine challenges of rapid review for diagnostic test accuracy. It is a good but brief protocol in my opinion, and therefore would benefit from further detail and justification as described below.

Major Recommendations

1. The authors have opted not to undertake a traditional systematic review to identify methods for rapid reviews of diagnostic tests. The reference list includes several previous related systematic reviews. Therefore, the authors should spend further time in the introduction justifying why a systematic review is not required, and instead why they have opted for the interview approach.

2. The methods of the semi-structured interviews are clear and thorough. Those for the international survey are less thorough. In particular the authors should provide further details as to how many people will be interviewed as part of the feasibility study, and what conditions must be met to proceed to the full survey from the feasibility study. What themes/questions will be asked as part of the survey?

Minor Recommendations

1. Abstract & Discussion - Within the Discussion of the Abstract and the opening of the Discussion, "conduction of" would be better described as "conducting".

2. Some sentences are very long e.g. Introduction, 1st paragraph. Please split these into shorter sentences to help improve the readability of the article.

3. Methods, International Survey - Define HTA.

4. Ethics - please add a reference for the Declaration of Helsinki ethical principles.
5. Declarations - "Not applicable" is an incorrect response for the "ethics approval" statement. Please update this with details of the ethics approval (as described prior to the Discussion).
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