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Reviewer’s report:

The involvement of stakeholders in health technology assessment and other healthcare related decisions is currently an imperative in most jurisdictions. This paper presents an important contribution to the growing literature on this topic. While the quality of the paper is sufficient to move forward to publications, I would like to offer some point for the authors to consider. I place these under two heading, serious issues to consider and minor issues to consider.

Serious issues to consider

1. What is a “perspective” and how does it differ from a “preference”? Clarity as to what the authors are eliciting from patients is vitally important. I don’t think that material that they have gathered from the respondents actually falls under either of these two concepts (i.e. criteria scores, performance weights or the qualitative feedback).

2. There is insufficient consideration of the effects of sampling, response rates and the notions that this data is stochastic.

3. This discussion could benefit from more critical discussion and comparison of the result to external sources, rather than rehashing the results.

4. There needs to be a more serious and detailed considerations of the limitations and potential alternative considerations of this study. Furthermore, if the authors persist with this as a methods piece (rather than a case study) then more serious consideration of the limitations and alternatives to the general approach of MCDA is needed.

Minor issues to consider

1. I believe that MCDA offers a “potential framework to systematize” rather than a “solution to systematize”

2. English grammar needs to be improved.

3. Is this a novel methods piece or a case study of an existing method?

4. Consistency in capitalization within the criteria would be beneficial.

5. Is it best to call the methods MCDA (a rather generic term) or an application of the EVIDEM framework. What if another MCDA methods was use (e.g. AHP), would it look the same?
**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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