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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very clearly written paper on an important topic which I agree we have little understanding of. To undertake an exercise such as nominal group technique is an appropriate way to address the need to better understand the research priorities of this population. I think it is close to being of publishable quality. Its main weakness as you say is the small number of participants and it would have been much stronger with more patient representatives to gain more of their perspectives and to minimize risk of the discussion being dominated by the 8 non patients around the table. However we do these small scale exercises and they can be valuable, especially locally and to others who do not need (or have the funds for) a rigorous approach such as that by the James Lind Alliance to inform their research plans. How were the participants selected?

What I would like to see is more depth about the issues participants said needed researching to bring it to life. For example, what is the problem with 'information' that requires research? What impact did they say TIA has on family members for that to warrant further research? Why do they think professionals need training? This would then move it on from being a report on an event to be a useful discussion of the issues raised.

It sounds like you had a great event and I can see much utility in the research questions you have come up with. I think readers would like more insight into what was discussed is all, ie the nature of the problems that need researching.
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