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Reviewer’s report:

This study is a useful addition to the literature on patient and public involvement (PPI) in developing clinical practice guidelines. It effectively highlights the gap between PPI standards and practice in the U.S. and the need for substantial improvement.

The rationales for PPI in guideline development are helpfully outlined in your discussion section. These rationales are important and so I suggest including very brief reference to them in the abstract and plain English summary. In addition to the articles you have referenced, I suggest also referring to: 'Patient and Public Involvement in the Development of Healthcare Guidance: An Overview of Current Methods and Future Challenges' - Rashid A, Thomas V, Shaw T & Leng G. in The Patient: Patient Centred Outcomes Research, ISSN 1178-1653, 2016, Vol 9, No 5.

Although your study focuses on the U.S., it is good to see reference to the international consensus on the importance of PPI in guideline development including the work of the Guidelines International Network (G-I-N).

Page 2, line 57 - Typo - I think this should read 'Compliance with these standards'

Page 5, line 58 - Please spell out IRB in full

Page 7, lines 20-58 - I suggest including these definitions in a glossary not in the main text, providing this fits in with the format for this publication.

Page 9, line 58 - Please clarify what you mean by 'protocols for guideline development', e.g. do you mean the protocols for each review question, as described in line 4, p.10 as 'draft research plan'?

Page 11, line 29 - Please clarify what you mean by 'mandatory' public comment.

Page 12, lines 17/18 - Typo - I think this should be 'During the conduct of the study'

Page 12, line 54 - I agree there does seem to have been a lack of progress in the U.S. since the IOM standards were published in 2011. Do you have evidence to back up this statement in reference to any baseline U.S. data prior to the publication of the IOM standards?
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