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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this paper that describes a user-centered design (UCD) process to develop clinical feedback reports. Overall I believe the paper to be well written, of interest and has interesting findings that contribute to the knowledge of developing usable and acceptable clinical feedback reports.

Overall I have just a few comments that I believe will improve the readability and understanding of the article. These are of a minor nature only and the methods and description of a UCD process I think is very well described, makes sense (to someone with some experience in designing clinical feedback reports) and sets out a reasonable protocol to follow.

1) I would like to know how much of the process the authors describe in the methods was determined in advance (is there a study protocol they could include?) and how much they refined throughout the process. Were there any steps that were difficult to implement or changes made to the process based upon experience?

2) Page 13 participants - please state the range of people contributing from each site and whether all sites contributed. The following section suggests all sites contributed however it is not clear in this section.

3) Page 15 requirements - the authors describe how the UCD process meant that one of the evidence-based key components of feedback was excluded (use of comparators). I would be interested to know more about how the authors/research team came to the decision to exclude this based upon the feedback received and whether they believe this will potentially impact the report effectiveness. Some guidance on resolving conflicts and the difficulties of 'single voice' dissenters in UCD would be helpful. This should also be discussed in the limitations of the study as the UCD process may recommend some key components are not included in final reports which have a known evidence-base for increasing effectiveness.

4) Finally I recommend the authors link their findings to the recent paper by Grimshaw et al 2019 paper and discuss how the UCD process fits in to the development of implementation laboratories where head-to-head trials of different ways of providing A&F can advance effectiveness and knowledge in A&F.
I hope these comments are useful and constructive. Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.
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