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Reviewer's report:

This paper addresses an important topic affecting a large proportion of the population. It is well very well written and organized.

Methods:

Methods appear to be sound, consisting of a stakeholder summit and a content analysis.

Stakeholder summit appears to be robust, including adequate representation: family advocates, clinicians, and researchers. Authors could indicate why these stakeholders were chosen and expand briefly on the "design-thinking techniques".

Likewise, content analysis appears to be sound with two reviewers and a third reviewer to resolve any discordances. Good explanation on the qualitative content analysis. Further detail would be good for the structured abstraction tool used; coding categories based on "existing ACP conceptual frameworks".

How do the findings from the stakeholder summit correspond/interrelate with the content analysis, specifically relating to "patient priorities and values in general"? Were criteria gathered from the stakeholder summit? Were these prioritized? Was a decision-theoretic framework used?

Results:

Explain further "users to complete wallet cards that specify emergency contact information".
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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