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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Authors should specify how many participants (or the percentage of participants) in each group selected each factor. While it is interesting that someone in each group (or in a certain number of groups) selected a particular item from a factor, it can be misleading. Did one person in each group select the factor? For instance, every group (AA and non-AA) selected morbidity/mortality factor. One person from each group selecting this factor is very different than a majority of participants selecting the factor. In addition, did more AA or non-AA within the groups select this factor? It is difficult to say that AA and non-AA both equally believe Morbidity/Mortality is a factor when 100% of the participants could have chosen that factor vs. 50% in another racial group, but since at least one person in each group selected that factor it is being counted as equal. This holds for all factors. This would be much more informative and compelling if you could quantify the number of participants who selected each factor.

2. Report the selections from Stage 1 as well. Stage 3 selections were after group discussions. This could be considered to be a small intervention. A comparison of selections before and after discussions is interesting and would add to this manuscript immensely.

3. Tables should not be broken down by stage of ESRD if analyses did not focus on the differences between these groups. Much of the procedure focuses on the different groups stratified by ESRD stage, yet analyses and results were completed. The tables could be collapsed across ESRD stage to make them more readable. In addition, once comment 1 is addressed, the tables should include a measure of how many people in each group endorsed each item or factor.

4. Address why open-ended responses provided by the participants were not included. Did AA or non-AA come up with other factors that were not on your list of 36?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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