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Author’s response to reviews:

Cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns: Manuscript Number: MIDM-D-19-00411 "Men’s view on participation in decisions about Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) screening: Patient and public involvement in development of a survey" submitted to BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Once again, we thank BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making for constructive criticism on our manuscript and for invitation to re-revise our manuscript and resubmit. This cover letter gives an overview on revisions and a point-by-point response to the issues raised in reviewer’s report.

By way of introduction, reviewer states that “This revised submission on public participation in development of a survey to aid in patient decisions about PSA screening clarified the concerns raised on initial review and has been substantially improved by the addition of new text and tables. Additional comments and suggestions are included below:”

Reviewer afterwards states that “Abstract: Conclusions - How did authors determine that the patient/public involvement improved the survey structure/content? Suggest changing the wording to reflect that the survey was modified or refined based on the PPI suggestions, as there was no objective measurement of whether the survey was improved.”
Authors’ comment:

Thanks for suggestion. This has been now changed. Please see Abstract section, page 3, line 5.

Reviewer adds a number of comments:

“Background: - Page 4, line 9-12: The issue with over-detection and over-treatment deals not just with cancers that would not lead to symptoms (QOL), but those that would potentially impact patients' life span and freedom from cancer specific mortality. “

Authors’ comment:

Thanks for comment. This has been now rephrased. Please see Page 4, line 9-12.

“- Page 7, line 7 to Page 8, line 12: This section is written in the present tense, whereas the rest of the manuscript is written in the past tense. Suggest starting Page 7, line 7 with: "The aim of our project was to describe PPI..." and carry the past tense throughout the aforementioned section for consistency throughout the manuscript.”

Authors’ comment:

Thanks for suggestion. Please see revised manuscript, pages 7-8.

“Results: - Page 12, line 16-19: Without a response rate, the authors should not suggest that "there appeared to be adequate interest". Recommend deleting the first sentence..”

Authors’ comment:

Thanks for suggestion. This has been now deleted. Please see revised manuscript, page 12.
Once again, the editor and reviewers are thanked for constructive criticisms and comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact in case of any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely,

Søren Birkeland

/March 5, 2020