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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I review this article as a patient/patient representative who has been involved as such in systematic reviews (e.g. Cochrane) and has developed a PROM to assess emotional consequences of having severe atopic dermatitis (manuscript accepted; in press).

The manuscript describes three studies, two systematic reviews and the development of a PROM. The consequence of needing to explain all three studies might be that the methodological aspects of the development of the PROM are quite briefly described. The manuscript is well written and extensively referenced. I have only a few comments.

Comment #1, line 130:
"We have prepared protocols to conduct the two reviews [24, 25]." It reads like these protocols were published as references 24 and 25. Yet, these references refer to guides/guidances. I would consider rewording.

Comment #2, line 269 - 283:
There is something going wrong with the references here. Many are referring to reference 58, sometimes double. So please could you correct these references, probably from 58 till 65.

Comment #3: PROM and COSMIN
Part of developing a PROM is to assess the reliability with a test-retest procedure. There is no mention of it in this protocol. When you are not planning to do this procedure, whilst referring to COSMIN, please explain why and include this as a limitation.
Furthermore, responsiveness is one of the COSMIN items. I am aware that the target group does not undergo an intervention, so that might not be feasible. To be more complete, I would describe the lack of this COSMIN-item. This could be a limitation, and as such described, when the tool is intended to be used to measure changes over time. Yet, it need not be a limitation per
se, as PROMs can also be used to assess the current state of a person. In that case I would describe this briefly in the protocol.

I wish the authors best of luck with their manuscript.

With kind regards,

Bernd Arents
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