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Reviewer's report:

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:

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.

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.
- 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.

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.
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.
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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?
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