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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

This is an interesting submission on public participation in development of a survey to aid patient decision making regarding PSA testing. As many organizations that publish guidelines regarding PSA screening now recommend an informed decision-making process between the provider and patient to determine whether to pursue PSA screening, this article highlights an opportunity for patient involvement in the development of a decision aid to inform patients about the decision to undergo PSA screening. While this is an informative submission, it could benefit from a more detailed and systematic presentation of the outcomes of the community and cancer PPI groups. For instance, the Results section could benefit from a more organized/categorized description of the types of suggestions that were made in each of the groups (i.e. simplifying wording, shortening vignettes), in order that others may benefit from the authors' experience in the process.

One aspect of the paper that was confusing and was not adequately addressed is why the authors chose to evaluate participants' desire to file malpractice complaints based on the case vignettes. This seems a bit extreme and immaterial to a decision regarding whether or not a patient wishes to undergo PSA screening. The authors should provide some rationale for including this in the submission.

Specific comments:

P2, line 6-7: Most bodies that publish prostate cancer screening guidelines (USPSTF, ACS, AUA) already recommend involving patients in decisions about PSA screening. Suggest: "Therefore, involving patients in decision-making about PSA screening is recommended".

P2, Methods: Methods should describe in more detail exactly how the case vignettes were developed.
P4, line 10-13: The statement that "Today, nonthreatening PCa cannot be accurately distinguished from aggressive forms which benefit from treatment..." is a vast oversimplification. There are a plethora of risk stratification methods, from nomograms to genomic tests. This statement should be rephrased to reflect that while these risk stratification methods exist, it is impossible to definitively tell which PCa may progress over time (or something to that effect).

P7, line 3: Please define GRIPP acronym and some explanation of GRIPP 2 principles

P7, line 3-6: The final paragraph of the introduction should more clearly and directly state the aims of the study

P8, line 10-19: The tense used is confusing - the paragraph starts out in the future tense (The survey will...), then the present tense (The survey aims...). This should be consistent throughout. It may help to change the order of the first and second paragraph of the methods section in order to present the choice of vignette structure among academic peers prior to discussing its dissemination.

P13, line 21-22: Please explain why the research team decided to place the case vignette first.

P15, line 9-10: The statement in the vignette "'it is not common' to test all for prostate cancer with PSA because the test is not safe enough" is misleading - the test is very safe; rather it is the risks and side effects associated with the diagnosis (prostate biopsy) and treatment (radiation, prostatectomy) that has led to the controversy regarding PSA screening

P16, line 2: important is mis-spelled

P16, line 4: The sentence "The workshop was finally wrapped up" is without explanation of when/why it was wrapped up. Either this should be explained or the sentence should be excluded.

P20, line 7-8: Why was it not practically possible for the respondents to decide whether to have the PSA test done, at least in some form? This seems to be a major missed opportunity for some quantitative data that would be informative. For example, if all respondents stated that they would have the PSA test done (or if all responded they would NOT have it done), this would be informative about the utility of the vignettes and might provide insight into whether the vignettes biased respondents one way or another.
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