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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a study describing the participation of PPI in the development of a survey regarding patients' preferences for involvement in PSA screening. The manuscript is well written and addresses an interesting topic. It may be strengthened by addressing the following.

1) While the authors attempted to achieve diversity in terms of socio-demographics and education level by recruiting participants from various social settings, there is no measure of participants' levels of health literacy which might influence their impressions of and suggestions for survey development. Ensuring participants with a broad range of health literacy might be important.

2) Another potential limitation of this approach is the failure to include women - particularly women who may be partnered with men. Women often have a large amount of influence over men's health care behaviors (at least in the US) and can significantly impact men in their health care choices. It would be interesting and perhaps important to know what the partners of men considering screening think of screening, and thus their impressions of the survey.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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