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Reviewer's report:

I thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. This is an interesting paper. Comments and suggestions to authors are as follow:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) The abstract is un-informative. Its background section is too long and the methods section is too short. It does not reflect well what the authors achieved: literature review (phase 1) and study #1 and study #2 (phase 2).

2) The literature review is relevant but would benefit from key citations from the Cochrane library (i.e., Cochrane Consumers & Communication Review Group relevant systematic reviews). The relevance of ref. 10 from the Cochrane library is not clear.

3) The authors refer to: a) feedback to providers of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) and b) values clarification exercise (VCE) as effective strategies to promote: i. active participation of patients during the consultation and ii. self-management.

Are the authors referring to 2 interventions? and 2 outcomes of interest? If so, they may want to review the literature on patients’ decision aids. Also, they may want to clarify the theoretical underpinnings of both interventions: PROMS and VCE. Lastly, they may want to clarify the relationship between shared decision making (top of p.7) and their outcomes.

4) Figure 1 provides a good illustration of the intervention development process. However, it is not clear if phase 1 was published or submitted for publication? It appears that phase 1 was a very thorough way of reviewing the literature, would the authors consider writing a distinct paper? If so, it would be helpful to understand better how phase 1 was used to inform phase 2.

5) Under the methods section, please move the statement about ethical approval at the end of this section.

6) The methods section is difficult to follow. It seems that the authors assessed both: i) patient and professional perspectives on PRISMS, and ii) barriers and facilitators to adoption in everyday practice using focus groups (study #1). However, the data collection procedure does not appear to include specific questions about barriers and facilitators to PRISMS adoption. Also, the results
section does not report any barriers or facilitators to PRISMS adoption.

Then, the authors interviewed patients about PRISMS (i.e., study 2). The results section is mainly focused on patients’ views about PRISMS. Perhaps the authors should consider splitting this paper into three distinct papers: phase 1 (i.e., literature review), study #1 and study #2 that were included in phase 2.

7) In line with the above comment, the results section is difficult to follow. It would be much appreciated if the authors could link the interview prompts in Box 2 with their results. In the discussion section, I am not convinced about using Box 8 to translate to readers the next relevant research questions. It overlaps with the “future research” section.

8) The discussion section opens up with the results of the literature review. However, in line with above comments, this should be dealt with as a distinct paper presenting the methods relevant to this literature review. There is very few discussion points pertaining to the assessment of both: i) patient and professional perspectives on PRISMS, and ii) barriers and facilitators to adoption in everyday practice using focus groups (study #1). Perhaps, the authors want to consider a distinct paper.

9) The authors discuss the study limitations but could also discuss how they may have affected their study results.
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