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Reviewer's report:

Interesting article on the development and acceptability of a patient leaflet on antibiotic use in secondary care. Further explanations or clarifications would be useful in the following areas:

Methods - Development - could you explain the feedback provided by PPI in relation to the development of the leaflet?

Methods - Interviews - could you provide a justification for the use of a think aloud approach and whether the researchers conducting the interviews were trained in cognitive interviewing? Also you have stated that the researchers either got the patients to read through the leaflet or they read it to them - this can elicit different responses from patients. There are different cognitive processes involved when patients either read something out loud or they are asked to listen to someone else reading to them. It would be useful to highlight this in the limitations section.

Results were very well written and explained the themes clearly.

Discussion and conclusions to the study were well explained.
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