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Reviewer’s report:

The authors organized a single event that involved 14 common citizens, who were in possession of the criteria defined by this study, in order to gather and organize patient perspectives and suggestions, starting from some existing publications, to create a workbook for other patients participating in a clinical trial.

Inclusion of patients in research is one of the most fervent issues of recent years, but while inclusion of patients in all major aspects of planning and evaluating of clinical trials requires the identification and training of so-called "Expert Patients", it is very important to involve the patient's vision in all subsidiary activities and in information materials that are intended for clinical trial participants, to ensure that the study achieve their goal better.

In particular, I feel very encouraging the experience described in this case-study, properly defined in methods and in its intended purpose.

Almost all of his limitations and weaknesses were already listed and analyzed by the authors. Probably the workbook would have been more complete and (maybe) more effective if there was a slightly larger number of participants in the event, because the number of 14 participants may still lead to bias due (for example) to the more communicative or persuasive ability of some participants, who could give more emphasis to their opinions, especially in working in small groups.

In addition, I would like to know if the authors hypothesized to have the presence among the discussants of patients who stopped drinking and smoking, to evaluate their experience.

Anyhow, in my opinion, this experience is relevant and could serve as a starting point for further patient engagement experiences.
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