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Introduction

This sentence is unclear:
“Recruiting participants who are representative of “ordinary patients”…”
I think they mean “ ‘The challenge of’ Recruiting…”

This statement is overstated:
“Our study sought to fill a pressing knowledge gap by…” no one study can fill a whole gap. One study can contribute part of the puzzle.

Results

95% CIs should be included around the reported percentages – the study has low numbers and it is important to see whether these differences are substantiated. Same for the mean scores on the Likert scales.

The patient involvement was large, and the costs documented – can the authors indicate what might be the optimal size of a patient consultation group?

Discussion

The manuscript would be strengthened by a clearer discussion about whether the priorities in the intervention group were ‘better’ than the control group. If is not enough to just reflect that they are ‘different’.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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