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Reviewer's report:

This is a useful paper describing the process of development and preliminary evaluation of an instrument designed to increase patient participation in clinical care processes for chronic condition care. The ultimate aim of the enhanced participation is to improve the quality of self care support (in particular the match between clinical care options chosen by health professionals and the patients own priorities for the sort of help and support they feel they need).

I would have liked a little more detail on how the think aloud exercise was conducted if the researcher was involved in prompting the patient to reflect on the process it would be good to know how this was done, and what prompts were used and how much reflection was directed to the current exercise or to the potential theoretical anticipated future use of the instrument in an imagined future consultation etc This would help the reader interpret the findings I think.

Overuse of the term “in general” and “generally” (16 times that I noted). This detracted a little from the readability of the paper and made me wonder if at times it was possible to offer a term that captured more specifically what was meant in each instance? In fact the repeated use of the term tends to distract from the very interesting and particular nuances and differences in views about PRISMS eg the difficulty in capturing time and variability, the difficulty in relating problems to expectations of help and support and what is feasible and achievable etc These differences seemed to me to be deserving of more weight and prominence that the constant assertions that PRISMS generally captured all the problems of concern and generally was easy to complete etc etc seemed to gloss over

It seemed that there was something of a paradox in the preference for the patients to complete the instrument at home

The link between Box 1 and 8 was not clear to me. Was it from reference 5 or was it a composite arising from an analysis of a wider range of literature by the authors? If so, given that the findings are specifically shaped under these questions, were the questions used as part of the framework analysis in data analysis of interviews etc? This could possibly be made a little clearer.

Given the tension identified in the “tick box” approach to QOF and the difficulties identified in this paper in how in instrument such as PRSIMS can or cannot capture issues of variability and context and interaction and expectations etc in relation to patients problems/symptoms, would it be worth reflecting on the
potential for PRSIMS to become another tick box exercise or on how planned use/testing of the intervention is to be/has been adapted to somehow account for this?

Minor revisions
Box 1 and 8: Could each of the questions actually be framed as a question? (or else should the title of Box 1 and 8 be changed?)
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