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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revisions

1. Page 24, para 1. It might be helpful to the reader if it was stated that the review by Cote et al was not within the field of health.

2. The authors use the term patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) later on in the article (p 30). Perhaps it would be better to use this earlier with examples (health status and quality of life) since it has become a widely used term within health-related research.

3. p 28, para 1. The fourth sentence could be improved, for example "Data collection as part of randomised trials of therapeutic interventions often includes patient reported outcome measures. How antecedent features in trials - in...".

Table 2. insert "the" before "researcher" in the second column.
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