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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions
In methods for the survey you refer to using previous participants in priority setting/. The word participant may be politically correct but it is not clear then that these are patients rather than health care professionals whose views you would not want to contaminate this patient centred focus. Please make explicit that individuals with vitiligo or their representative or guardian - Carer could be their doctor and misconstrued.

Table 5 was confusing to me even when looking at the images. I think it would be much clearer to tabulate the cumulative percent in each column eg it seems only a small number found complete repigmentation was satisfactory.

Discretionary revision. This is qualitative data and this reviewer found the quotations in italics tangible but one quote doesn’t encapsulate the whole data set and may be giving just one example is not going to be truly representative. The tables summarise the data nicely and these quotes were to the reviewer un-necessary. opinions could differ and others might like this.
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