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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

This is a really well written article on an important issue. The study is contextualised well within the existing literature. The question posed is a new and well defined one. Using the James Lind Alliance's work as the basis for the study is an excellent idea. The authors acknowledge the limitations of the study - in particular the fact that it refers only to one exercise in priority setting. This doesn't reduce the usefulness of the study.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The methods are very clearly set out and easy to understand. I like the design - particularly the fact that there is a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. There is sufficient detail to replicate the study.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The data are clearly set out and appear to be well controlled. My background is in qualitative research. This element of the study is clearly described.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

Yes.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

As far as I am aware, yes.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes, the conclusions are well framed within the evidence that is generated by the data. Importantly, the paper does not overstate the findings.

7. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes
8. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, the article is clearly written. The lay summary is very good. There are few uses of acronyms and where they are used, they are explained clearly. I liked the glossary of terms at the end of the article. The argument is clearly laid out.

Summary:

This is a well written article describing a well designed study with excellent co-designed methods. The research team has a balance of skills. The findings are well set out and are within the scope of the study’s perspective.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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