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Reviewer's report:

+ A succinct summary of the JLA PSP is necessary.

+ A table describing the comparative between the "original" and the "adaptative" JLA PSP is recommended. The reference to a "toolkit" in the title should have a reality in the paper!

+ There is no "Results" section in the paper. The results are mixed in the "Methods" section. For example, a remark like "through twitter conversations with US counterparts we forged a collaboration with researchers from the CF Foundation", in the Methods section, is a bit disturbing. The whole paragraph on "Further development of the Top ten research priorities in CF" seems a bit out of purpose in a Method section as well; these are perspectives.

+ The discussion could be a bit more elaborated (more reflection on the "lone" questions management, the participants' experiences ... and less on your future work related to the priorities identified - not the purpose of the article, i think...)

+ The reference to "clinical trials" as THE form of Research is a bit reductive. Many research questions that matter and can benefit CF patients can also be answered from epidemiological or prospective studies, and not only "clinical trials".

+ Twitter jargon, like "impressions'' and "engagments", should be explained and discussed...

+ Is it necessary to mention the BlueJean brand more than once (in the Methods section) ? Does BlueJean own very specific features that no other videoconferencing platforms possess ? (publicity...)
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