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Reviewer’s report:

Great work. Important and good to see. A couple of minor comments:

p5, Line 49 - please specify if 'communication' is one of the IOM standards. If not perhaps highlight why it was selected

p5, Line 58 - please define IRB

p6, Line 11 - please define 'independent guideline developer'. It's a sub-category in the analysis but here it is a pre-requisite for inclusion

p8, Line 27 - please reference 'Wilson's method'

p14, Line 9-10 - discrepancies between patient and physician views are not necessarily barriers, but are precisely the reason you want patients in the room!

p15, Line 15 - slightly misleading. The study looked at the PPI approaches of guideline developers. The way it's phrased implies a systematic assessment of PPI methodologies as a concept whereas this was a more practical examination of how individual developer organisations put these concepts into practice.

p15, line 31 - alongside trustworthiness there's also the issue of credibility and implementability if patients haven't been included in developing recommendations

P15, lines 38 onwards. It might also be interesting to reflect on how North American compares with other GIN members. Maybe the next project!
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