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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the authors:
The authors present a report in the development, user-testing and refinement of learning resources to teach primary school children to assess claims about treatment effects. The fact that this is being submitted after more than 2 years from the use of these resources in a clinical trial and its publication is somehow unusual, but I believe that the lessons learned from the authors in this process can be of interest to readers, particularly to other researchers in similar fields.

The main concern about the manuscript is about its structure: The discussion doesn't start with a summary of the main findings. Moreover, part of the results are reported in the discussion, without being mentioned in the results questions (e.g. the teachers' and children's initial understanding of the scope of the project, that led to changes in the learning resources, and so on through ease of use, to identification). The authors might want to consider reorganizing the manuscript accordingly.

Minor comments:
Abstract:
1. Please add the full definition of the IHC abbreviation.

Methods:
2. Page 6 line 35: "Patient and Public Involvement Statement". I'm not sure this reflects the involved persons. Please considered changing it into something like "End-users and policy-makers involvement".

Results:
3. Page 6 line 46-47: "We started with the list of 32 Key Concepts identified at the beginning of this project 15. However, 24 concepts proved to be too much to learn in a school term."
4. From these two sentences, it is not clear how you moved from 32 to 24 concepts. I know that this is mentioned later in File 10 "Based on input from the teachers, we judged that primary school children could learn 24 of the 32 concepts.", but the reader might feel he lost something (at least I did). Consider changing to something like: "We started with the list of 32 Key Concepts identified at the beginning of this project, 24 of which were judged as appropriate to learn for the target population. However, 24 concepts proved to be too much to learn in a school term."
5. Page 7, line 14-15: please provide a brief explanation of what the CARL is, as the ref is still not accessible.
6. Page 7, line 6: "other sources" is vague, please considering citing/defining
7. Page 8 line 43: there seem to be an extra space before the word simplify, and the word should start with capital S
8. Page 9, line 46: "Revise and restructure the content and added a structured lesson plan". I think
Discussion:
9. Page 10, line 26: "However, they had found that students entering the IB programme were not sufficiently prepared. They wanted to test our resources specifically to find out if they might help to address this" Who is "they"?

References:
10. Ref 16 can now be fully cited (not only published online).

Box 1:
11. The concept "If possible, people should not know which of the treatments being compared they are receiving" is reported twice, under "Key Concepts taught in The Health Choices Book" and "Other Key Concepts prioritised for children"
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