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Reviewer's report:

General
The paper compares various, currently approved, HGH delivery systems with a prototype electronic device. This is a relevant question and is generally believed that characteristics of a delivery device may have an impact on compliance.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Result section: with regard to the statement that the electronic device prototype is better accepted than others, it is unclear how this conclusion was reached (based on what kind of comparison). What statistical procedure was used.
2. Methods: How was the list of 19 attributes validated? This is crucial question.
3. Results: it seems that the patients had different opinion versus the other 3 groups of participants. Please, provide data in this section and comment in the Discussion section.
4. Figure 3 is pretty complex. I propose to find an easier way to compare various devices. An average reader may have problems to get the message.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. Background, pg 3: It is important to elaborate more precisely on how devices are impacting compliance and which other factors are involved. Please, provide some data on who is injecting the drug (parents, pts, nurses). This is different for different patients subgroups. It is an important question, but not elaborated in the introduction
2. Discussion: how the list of 5 most important attributes compare with the literature?
3. Discussion: please provide some analysis on why the outcomes was different in the pt subgroups versus health care professionals and parents.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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