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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript with the title 'How do we incorporate patient views into the design of health-care services for older people' is clearly written and contains a relevant topic. As a reviewer I have some comments, as follows: 1. The running title does not completely cover the content of the manuscript, because the authors don't discuss the "how" but they only describe 4 proposed possible strategies. 2. In the abstract, I miss the aim of this manuscript. 3. Background section: not only in the UK many older people will have most or all of their natural teeth but also in other industrial countries. 4. The authors describe (poor) oral health issues for all older people. However most of these oral health (care) issues involve frail and care dependent older people, not robust older people. It is important to differentiate groups of older people (see also the article of Pretty et al, The Seattle Care Pathway for securing oral health in older patients, Gerodontology, 2014). These groups may also have different views on oral health care services. The manuscript would be improved when the authors add some remarks on this. 5. The abstract contains a discussion. However, I miss the discussion section in the article for the authors to discuss the pro- and cons of the 4 proposed methodological approaches, which next steps should be made and what the possible inhibiting and enabling factors are to implement such type of research.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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